DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 225 EA 005 959

AUTHOR	Boardman, Richard; Brandt, Linda
TITLE	METCO--A Descriptive Report.
INSTITUTION	Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	68
NOTE	168p.; A related document is ED 047 076
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$7.80
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Action Programs (Community); *Bus Transportation; Civil Rights; *Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Innovation; Elementary Schools; *Integration Effects; Parent Participation; Program Descriptions; School Community Cooperation; School Integration; Secondary Schools; Suburban Schools; Transfer Programs; *Urban Schools; *Voluntary Integration
IDENTIFIERS	Boston; METCO; *Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity

ABSTRACT

METCO is a nonprofit organization that provides screening, placement, and busing services for Negro children (K-12) from predominantly black schools in Boston to predominantly white schools in 16 of the cities and towns surrounding Boston. All of the students, representing a variety of academic, socioeconomic, and family backgrounds, volunteer for the program. The primary objective of the program has been to provide a better educational experience for the innercity students. A secondary program objective has been to increase social contact and enhance communication between black urban and white suburban children. This publication presents a chronology of program-related events, beginning with the genesis of the program in 1964. Program data stem from published reports, newspaper articles, and discussions with individuals directly and indirectly involved in the program. Findings from a sociometric questionnaire, administered in 1967 to study the degree and nature of social interaction in METCO classrooms, are summarized and labeled. (Document may reproduce poorly in hard copy because of marginal legibility.) (Author/MLF)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

M5

ED 088225

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

METCO - A DESCRIPTIVE REPORT

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Prepared by
Richard Boardman and Linda Brandt

for the

Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016

1968

EA 005 959

Best Copy Available

METCO - A DESCRIPTIVE REPORT

One of the most successful and unique bussing programs in the country is that developed by METCO, the Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity, in the Boston, Massachusetts, metropolitan area. A review of selected information on this program indicates that there are several factors which have contributed significantly to its development. This paper will present these factors with a chronology of program-related events, and will speak to the uniqueness of the program as well as its strength and limitations. Sources of information used here, while somewhat limited include published reports, newspaper articles, and discussions with individuals directly and indirectly involved in the program.

The METCO bussing program which was first implemented in the fall of 1966, involves the transporation of pupils from Boston schools to suburban schools. More specifically, it includes the enrollment transfer of minority group pupils from Boston ghetto schools to schools in a number of suburban communities

Developmental factors

The beginnings for the program date back to at least 1964 when a school boycott by Boston parents, and a report on Boston school conditions by the Commissioner of Education, spurred the formation of concerned "rights" groups in both Boston and surrounding suburban towns. An important feature of the suburban organizations was the firm pattern of communication among them and the increasing coordination of their activities.

Specific program development was initiated in a mid-urban (i.e., a Yonkers to N.Y.C. as opposed to a Scarsdale to N.Y.C. relationship) and involved area parents, rights group representatives, school committee members, a university professor and area students (i.e., a fairly broad based group). Word was quickly spread to the various 'rights' groups through the communications network already established. Urban and suburban interests combined and the METCO group took shape and began to formulate its program.

In addition to the communication and coordination factors, it is important to mention the essentially ingrown or inbred nature of the educational institution in the Greater Boston area (excluding the Boston Public School system which lives with its own brand of incest). By ingrown or inbred, we do not imply necessarily a negative connotation, but rather describe the informal structure of communication and cooperation among area educators. It is an area where, a call to the right places can move mountains or, if desired, hold them firmly fixed Area educators and those interesed in education know one another, are in touch with one another, and function together in a profoundly fraternal atmosphere.

The initiators of the METCO program were grounded in the educational institution and well versed in its operation. In the course of the developmental stages of the METCO program, all relevant parties were contacted and involved at the 'right' moment. Newspapers in the area were also kept aware of program developments and remained supportive of the program from its outset.

Complete development of the program required passage of specific legislation permitting the transfer of pupils to different school systems. The coordinated efforts of METCO and others led to both the passage of a significant state racial imbalance law, and a law allowing school systems to decide their own role in the METCO program. The relative ease with which the bussing program was formulated and developed is clearly a credit to the skill of the METCO planning group. In addition it is important to emphasize that this development group was private and clearly independent of any school system, i.e., not bound by the image or regulation of a given community. The independence of the METCO planning group has proved a major strength for the development of the program.

The basic characteristics of the plan itself also played an important part in its acceptance. The program involved first, only a small group of bussed youngsters, at the outset, spread over a number of school systems and yielding perhaps one or two bussed youngsters per receiving school. Second, youngsters selected to participate in the program were to be carefully screened by both the sending agency and the receiving system. A select first year bussed pupil group was insured. Third, the program provided for all costs. Receiving school systems would be reimbursed for all pupils enrolled. Fourth, primary responsibility for pupil welfare was assumed by METCO auxiliary groups formed to oversee pupil activities outside the classroom. Essentially, the program was designed to provide advantages for all and disadvantages for none. Negative reaction to the program was small, occurring only in a few suburban communities where relatively strong conservative or right wing political groups existed.

Another important factor for the development of the METCO program has been its method of funding. From the outset, three separate sources of funding have been maintained; Massachusetts State Department of Education funds which have assisted with pupil transportation costs, USOE Title III funds which cover pupil tuition costs in receiving schools, and funds from Carnegie Foundation which have been used entirely in the administration of the program. Separate administrative funding has provided an important flexibility for the program and has been deemed important by the program administrators.

It seems fair to say, that at least two years of careful planning and development went into the METCO program prior to its actual operation in the fall of 1966. Its planners were skilled, unattached, and experienced in the workings of the educational institution in the area. As the program enters its third year, it is accepted by virtually all area residents. Metco is now an educational fixture in the area. The program continues to expand as much as the funding will allow. A total of 3000 bussed puils has been stated as a possible maximum for the program, though it is possible that this total could be surpassed when and if the State of Massachusetts takes over complete operation of the program, an end desired by METCO.

Historical Chronology

Turbulence was not a characteristic of METCO's development. There were few instances of effective opposition to the plan, although there was some, notably in the towns of Wellesley and Winchester. For the most part, the chronology of events during 1966-67, 67-68, 68-69 academic years reveals an orderly progression from inception to the present. The number of student participants in the bussing plan has doubled with each academic year. The number of communities able and willing to participate has increased each year. Further, many of the already-participating communities have requested additional students from METCO.

Following is a chronological ordering of events, presented for each year that METCO has functioned. It provides a valuable synopsis of the events which have shaped METCO to its present state.

Late 1965

December 3rd. A bill enabling children to attend schools in cities and towns other than that in which they reside was filed on behalf of the Mass. Federation for Fair Housing and Equal Rights (an umbrella group over suburban rights committees). The bill (S.110) was an extension of the intent of the Racial Imbalance Act of 1965 (passed in August). The provision for which S.110 was an elaboration stipulated that there could be "voluntary cooperation between cities and towns to relieve (racial) imbalance".

December 14th. An exploratory meeting was held in suburban Brookline. Prof. Trilling (major initiator of METCO) spoke to 65 school representatives and citizens. The State Department of Education and the Mass. Council for

Public Schools had representatives present. Plans were set to implement the program at this time. By the end of December the basic METCO program was devised, and the name of the organization chosen.

1966

February 9th. Proposal for funding was submitted to the U.S. Office of Education under Title III of 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

February 14th. Proposal for funding of administrative expenses submitted to Carnegie Corporation of New York under the auspices of the Council for Public Schools.

February 19th. Meetings between METCO and Boston School Committee begin. METCO is well organized and prepared for the confrontation.

March 7th. State house hearings begin on S.110.

March 21st. Boston School Committee votes 3-2 to endorse METCO. They stipulate that local funds (Boston) are not to be used to support the program.

March 24th. METCO incorporation meeting. By laws are prepared and a slate of Officers, Executive Committee and Board of Directors are drawn up. Application papers are filed with Mass.

April 11th. Two communities have requested to join in METCO plan. Brings number of participating communities to six. The requests necessitate submitting a revised proposal to the Office of Education.

April 14th. Operation Exodus (the other grass roots bussing plan in Boston) has mixed feelings about METCO as they were apparently bypassed in receiving transportation funds. They call for cooperation between Operation Exodus and METCO.

April 27th. METCO officers and participating superintendents (from towns of Brookline, Lexington, Newton, Wellesley, Braintree, and Arlington) met at the State Department of Education offices with HEW Title III representative. Preliminary approval of proposal given.

May 22nd. Carnegie Corporation awards a grant for 126,100.00 to cover administrative costs.

May 22nd. Wellesley anti-METCO group emerges, "Operation Challenge METCO". Essentially right-wing, they are concerned with the legality of Wellesley's involvement.

May 24th. 10% of the voters in Wellesley voted No on METCO participation. The School Board states that it will accept METCO students anyway and refuse the results of the referendum.

May 24th. METCO Board of Directors appointed. Executive officers are Mr. Joseph Killary, Exec. Director (from State Department of Education); Ruth Batson, Associate Director; Mrs. Elizabeth Johnson, Office Manager.

June . Final funding approval from the Office of Education early in June. Staff begins to select participants and arrange for transportation contracts. Continued throughout summer.

June 22nd. An amendment to S.110 is proposed which would necessitate town and city approval for involvement in bussing plan. The amendment is sponsored by the Wellesley anti-METCO group.

July 28th. House approves bill, but rejects the Wellesley amendment. House session allows local school committees to make sole decision for inclusion in bussing plan.

August 13th. S.110, signed into law. METCO Program is ready to begin.

November 21st. Initial newspaper reports are favorable. The "host families" idea (see following section) seems to be working very well.

1967

January 12th. Operation Exodus funds are cut drastically from a request for 180,000.00 to funding of 20,000.00. METCO is viewed as major opposition.

March 12th. Newspaper article published which indicates that: 1. METCO program has fostered individual growth in students. 2. A special program for remedial reading is begun in Wellesley. 3. METCO "host families" and volunteers are active in their support of METCO in their local communities.

March 14th. Boston School Committee makes some attempt to take credit for some of the METCO accomplishments. Their claim is rejected by METCO.

May 26th. Boston School Committee moves to sponsor a bussing of 387 students from Roxbury schools (black) to North End schools (white).

June 28th. Winchester rejects METCO. Although the School Committee sponsored METCO participation, a town vote overruled their proposed action.

June 29th. METCO rejects Winchester. Even though the town vote is not binding on the School Committee, METCO decides that there would be too little degree of town sponsorship to operate the program.

July 27th. A program parallel to METCO sponsored by the Catholic church is initiated. Arrangements are made to cooperate with METCO on transportation. Scholarships are made available to students in The Bridge program (name of parochial bussing program).

August 25th. $87,000.00 in state funds are given to bussing program. Transportation costs are being taken over by state funding.

September . The METCO program this year will have 425 student participants as compared to 220 in the original program. The number of communities requesting and receiving METCO students has risen from the original seven to sixteen. Four original communities added students and nine other school committees voted to participate but could not due to lack of funds.

December 19th. Winchester (see above) reconsiders.

1968

May 21st. Wellesley Fair Housing and Equal Rights group provide a scholarship for the first METCO graduate.

June 21st. State Attorney General reports that towns and cities (in this case legislative power is really vested in the school committees) can vote to reduce tuition for S.110 participations, that is, METCO.

August 8th. Expansion of budget is not possible. Funding will be at the same level as fiscal 67-68 (395,713.00).

August 14th. Youth of Winchester vote in favor of METCO participation.

August 18th. Winchester School Committee once again decide to join METCO effort. Plan is accepted by METCO. Youth of the town are important to this acceptance as they have organized a pro-METCO group.

August 21st. Anti-METCO group in Winchester urges a referendum on METCO participation.

August 25th. Teenagers and parents in a team outside of METCO's self-imposed one hour transportation limits insist that METCO accept space for five students. They pledge assistance in transportation problems.

September 3rd. After much debate, METCO decides not to go to Winchester schools. At first, Winchester decided against the METCO program, then changed its mind (School Committee voted for sponsorship). The anti-METCO group in Winchester collected enough signatures for a referendum on METCO participation. 41% of voters voted 23,000 to 1,900 against METCO involvement. Although this vote was not binding on the School Committee, METCO decided it would be unwise to let Winchester participate.

September 9th. METCO rejects plan to initiate a reverse-bussing plan which would carry white suburban students to ghetto schools.

September ____. Although funds were not increased this year, METCO plans to expand its operation. There will be 907 students participating in METCO this school year. Also, the number of sponsoring communities has increased from sixteen to twenty-eight.

Special Programs

There are a number of special programs which are oscillary to the main METCO aim of bussing black students to the suburbs. For the most part, these programs have developed as METCO has gained stature, although a few were included as program components from METCO's inception.

The programs are easily grouped under three major categories; those which are supplementary to community sponsorship and service, those which are "spin-offs" of the original METCO plan and the evaluation conducted and that in progress of the students who participate in METCO.

Community sponsorship and service.

A. Community Committees consist of volunteers who have usually been the most vociferous sponsors of METCO and serve as local coordinators. They seek and select "host families" (see below) for METCO students and generally serve as liaisons for METCO and local school affairs.

A Roxbury Community Committee and Council were also joined to enable the families of METCO students to become better acquainted with the receiving suburban communities. Arrangements were made to attend PTA meetings, form community discussion groups and strengthen social contacts between suburban and Roxbury families.

B. Host families were found for each student in his suburban community. For the most part, the host family is that of one of the student's classmates (homeroom on secondary level). Providing this service not only alleviates the student's family of concern about illness or other untoward events, but provides a unique opportunity for "family interaction" and friendship. In many cases, this arrangement has led to broadened social and cultural exposure for both students. Host families also make it possible for the METCO student to stay late for school or social events as they willingly provide transportation or overnight accommodations.

C. METCO Parents' Councils have been formed with representation determined by the sponsoring community. The Councils serve an advisory function to METCO and as a conduit of information on the program to other parents.

D. Although a formal tutorial service was not suggested by METCO, many communities have spontaneously volunterred to provide this service to METCO students. Although most of the organized program tutor "basic education skills" such as remedial reading and/or math, there is probably a fairly high incidence of informal tutorial sessions that are never reported!

E. After school participation by METCO students has become a central part of the METCO program. Late busses are provided several days a week in many communities so that students can participate freely without risking a loss of transportation.

Supplementary METCO Programs

A. Curriculum materials for the Study of Black History

A comprehensive bibliograph has been compiled of possible books on black history for readers of various ages. Because of the recency of this program, not much is known of its future plans as a written report has not been made.

B. Law students from Harvard and Tufts will be assigned to the METCO office during the present school year.

C. New Careers program: This is a federally funded program from the Labor Dept. The aim of the program is to provide training and jobs for the poor and unskilled - in human service agencies (paramedical and social service). METCO acts as a recruiting agency for the program.

D. In Service Training Program for Teachers

This program is directed toward giving suburban teachers a handle on teaching "disadvantaged" children. It has been funded at 27,200.00 for two years and is directed by Dr. Norman Zinberg.

Evaluation of METCO Program

Two studies have been conducted up~~t~~ to this point, one on academic achievement of METCO students during their first year in the program, and one on their sociometric status.

Academic Achievement

As backup data intelligence test scales were collected for 150 of 220 participating students. The title of the "intelligence test" is not stipulated. Average score for METCO students is 102, the scores range from 77 to 130 with 68% of the scores (± 10) falling between 90 and 110. The distribution of the scores does not differ significantly from the national sample, therefore the METCO group can be viewed as falling within the national average.

Achiev[illegible]ent test scores from the Metropolitan Achievement Test were available for 66 elementary school children in three school districts. Scores for 16 of these children were not used as the sample size was too small.

Five scales of the MAT were used in this analysis; Word Knowledge Reading, Spelling, Arithmetic Computation, Arithmetic Problem-solving and Concepts. The scales were given six months apart.

Initial Results for National Norms

Scale	Months above (+) or below (-) National Norm
Words	-1
Reading	-5
Spelling	0
Arith Comp.	-5
Arith Prob.	-6

Test Results Six Months Later

Scale	Above (+) or Below (-) National Norm	Net Change
Words	+2	+3
Reading	-2	+3
Spelling	+7	+7
Arith Comp.	-4	+1
Arith Prob.	-5	+1

Discussion. In some cases, the scores advanced more than the expected six months - a reversal of the previously established trend of falling behind.

Gain in reading, words and spelling are statistically significant (acceptance or rejection level not specified, must assume its $\leq .05$).

Sociometric Status

In January 1967, a sociometric questionnaire was administered to all students, grades three through six, in ten schools. This sample included a sample of 71 students from the total of 220 METCO students. A sample of 115 students who had entered the same schools at the same time as METCO students were identified. Hypothesis were tested as to whether METCO students were significantly different than:

a. all other students

b. other transfer students.

These conclusions were drawn from the results:

a. METCO boys are significantly less popular than the Norm, but fall within the range of other transfer boys.

b. METCO girls are significantly less popular than the Norm, but not different from other transfer girls.

c. METCO students, as well as other transfer students are not different from Norm for per cent of choices reciprocated.

d. METCO students are not different from Norm or from other transfer students in their reciprocal percents, after reciprocal choices with other METCO students are removed.

Future concerns for evaluation

1. Achievement and school attitudes

Reading and math achievement tests (not specified) will be administered to all METCO students, grades two through twelve in October and April. A sample of siblings of METCO students will be tested at the same time. In April, all METCO students and sibs will complete a "classroom climate questionnaire".

2. Aspirations and Attitudes

This questionnaire will be given to all METCO students and their sibs. The content will be directed to eliciting attitudes on METCO, integration, white kids, etc.

3. Existing interview and questionnaire data on many participants of METCO

Much data has been collected throughout the existence of METCO from students, parents, host families, etc. A clinical psychologist will subjectively analyze the data.

4. Local school system data

Each local METCO coordinator has been asked to keep a log of events regarding METCO. A report will be written by each coordinator based on his records.

5. Exceptional Cases study

During METCO's history, a small number of students have been referred to a social service agency for guidance and diagnostic work. A study has been proposed to study the incidence, onset and etiology of their behavior problems.

6. Study of METCO communities

Still in the planning stages, questions are being directed to the effects of METCO on various communities. Also, concern for the key factors which led to METCO participation.

Conclusion

It would be much too flippe to dismiss the evaluation attempts made thus far by METCO. They are rather stingy, but METCO is also trying to recoup some of those losses. The data hasn't been thrown out, it just hasn't been analyzed. Of course, there seems, at least up to this Fall, to have been a definite lack of initiative to get at valuable information, i.e., the "people" variables.

The unprogrammatic and rather cavalier manner of approaching evaluation seems to be a hallmark of "grass roots" as "action" projects. And, it is true that most successful action projects were definitely not planned to exploit the situation for further knowledge ("research"). They can hardly then be criticized for their deficiencies in evaluation, although it's very comfortable and professional to groan over the loss of all that priceless information!

"METCO has functioned very well; it provides a real service (their only program concern) and acts as a model for similar projects." It would be a luxury to have a handle on some of the important, duplicable manueverings that took place. Because of that desire, the "new" direction of research seems very refreshing. The final evaluation report (June), which will incorporate all the projects listed previously, will be welcome reading.

SUMMARY

In developing this paper, an attempt has been made to point to several of the key factors in the development of what is essentially a carefully planned and implemented program. There can be no question that the program appears completely successful.

Yet, coupled with the apparent program success is an absence of information which suggests that some questions might be raised about the value of the program and perhaps ultimately about its success. For example, program evaluation has been limited, and this is perhaps as it should be in an action program. The void, however, which has been left by the absence of evaluation has left the program with little knowledge of what can be called 'people things'. In other words, we have no real idea what has happened to people, namely those bussed and those with whom they come in contact. The impression that one gets from conversations with various individuals involved with the program is that person to person interactions have been a rather mixed bag. Glowing comments from first year students can apparently be placed against the more militant, 'turned off' reation, of other students now entering their third year in the program. As the program expands, it has included within it pupils with a broader range of feeling and abilities.

It seems safe to say at this point that performance and attitudes are being effected by the METCO program and that this effect is generally positive. Beyond this, it is difficult to comment given the data available, and, perhaps more importantly, the absence of an adequate standard against which to judge program success or failure. The existance of the program and the involment of increasing numbers of people in it is probably the best measure of its success available.

APPENDIX OF

Published Reports

METCO

Suburban Education
for
Urban Children
(Revised October, 1967)

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY
(METCO)
178 HUMBOLDT AVENUE   DORCHESTER, MASSACHUSETTS
617-427-1545

September of 1966 saw over two hundred children and youth from Boston's "inner city" board buses which were to carry them to a totally new educational experience in suburban schools - an experience that would engender new friendships, encourage new dialogue, and provide the opportunity to eliminate or reduce the academic gap which would otherwise be a lifetime handicap.

This report is dedicated to these young people, the more than two hundred who joined them in September of 1967, and their parents in recognition of their extra effort to obtain that which should be their birthright.

METCO

AN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM which provides a suburban education for Boston students almost all of whom are Negro. The decision to participate in the program is entirely voluntary on the part of the families and the suburban school committees.

THE OBJECTIVES include the provision of a quality, integrated education which will reduce or close existing academic gaps; a degree of integrated learning experience for suburban students who are living in a multi-racial world; and an increase in dialogue between urban and suburban citizens in the metropolitan area.

FUNDING for the program is largely from a U.S. Office of Education grant under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Carnegie Corporation supports the administration and is assisted by a small grant from the Stern Family Fund.

STATE FUNDING under Chapter 506 of the Acts of 1966 provides for additional students. Direct payments are made to individual communities by the State Department of Education. METCO cooperation in the Boston area is recommended but not required.

THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS in the combined Federal and State programs has increased from 220 in the original program last year to 425 this year.

THE NUMBER OF COMMUNITIES has increased from the original seven - Arlington, Braintree, Brookline, Lexington, Lincoln, Newton, and Wellesley to sixteen by the addition of Concord-Carlisle Regional District, Marblehead Sharon, Walpole, Weston, and Westwood through increased Federal funds, and Framingham, Needham, and Reading through State funds. In addition, Brookline, Newton, and Wellesley added students with State funds while Lincoln added students with Federal funds. Lexington sought additional students and nine other school committees voted to participate for the first time but the funds were limited. The nine are Cambridge, Hingham, Lincoln-Sudbury, Malden, Natick, Scituate, Wakefield, Wayland and Winchester.

THE GRADE PLACEMENT of the students varies from kindergarten to grade twelve and the number of students invited varies from eight or nine in some of the sixteen communities to fifty in Wellesley, seventy-five in Newton, and one hundred in Brookline. Lincoln has invited ten kindergarten children each year and has indicated a desire to continue this practice.

THE STUDENTS CAN ANTICIPATE COMPLETION OF GRADE 12 if funds are available since all committees have indicated that this is their desire. While this is not a legally binding commitment, it is a sincere intent on the part of the present committees.

A METCO PARENTS COUNCIL has been formed with representation determined by the community to which the children go to school. The council serves in an advisory role to the METCO staff and as a clearing house of information about the program in particular and education in general for the parents. This is in addition to full parental participation in PTA and other school activities in the more than forty schools with METCO students. The attached letter, included with Mr. Smith's permission, demonstrates one role of the council.

THE SUCCESS OF THE PROGRAM to date has been significant in the academic area as indicated by the attached release and overall as evidenced by the fact that other than those that have moved, only three students have left the program by choice and it is possible that one of these will return at a later date if family circumstances change. Further evidence is found in the positive reports of students, parents, host families, school administrators, and school committees. Five of the original seven school committees sought additional students and eighteen new communities asked to participate.

AFTER SCHOOL PARTICIPATION in student council,,extra help classes, dramatic clubs, sports, etc. has become an integral part of the program since late buses are provided three or four afternoons a week.

HOST FAMILIES are available for each student in the program. They are a source of information for the parents who are not familiar with the local school procedures and an on-the-scene source of help for the child and school if it is needed. The role played by the host families has been a vital factor in the success that METCO has enjoyed.

METCO COMMUNITY COMMITTEES consisting of volunteers who have, in most cases, been instrumental in bringing METCO to their community serve as local coordinators. They seek host family volunteers, organize parent-host family activities, and perform a variety of other services to assist both METCO and local school staffs.

September 27, 1967

METCO Parents
Boston, Massachusetts

Dear Parents:

BUSSING!! OPEN ENROLLMENT!!! BOSTON NAACP ALLEGES SCHOOL BIAS!!

ROXBURY CANDIDATE DEFEATED IN SCHOOL COMMITTEE RACE!!!

INCUMBENT SCHOOL COMMITTEE SLATE RE-ELECTED!!!

These were the headlines that launched the Roxbury community into a giant, active protest movement against the Boston educational establishment.

From this environment, new horizons were envisioned and trial educational programs begun. Among these was the METCO Program.

The METCO Program has shown concrete elements of overwhelming success. This is principally because of the enthusiastic and tireless daily effort of the METCO Program Children. They are constantly involved, from the kindergarten to the pre-college level, every day of every week, in their assigned schools of Arlington, Brookline, Braintree, Lexington, etc. They participate in student councils, athletics special study assignments, and suburban-host activities. As living monuments, they stand very, very much involved.

However, only by active and similar involvement by every METCO parent (father and mother) in telephone exchanges, workshop seminars, P.T.A., and school/host family exchanges, and other activities funneled through an alert and sensitive METCO Parent Council can the METCO Staff and the U.S. Office of Educational Opportunity really know that we the METCO parents, as well as the children, favor the METCO Program and wish to have it continually funded and perhaps enlarged.

WE URGE YOU: "GET INVOLVED!!!"

Yours sincerely,

Irvin Smith, Chairman

METCO Parent Council

IS:my

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY
(METCO)
178 HUMBOLDT AVENUE DORCHESTER, MASSACHUSETTS

For Release Tuesday A.M.
September 19, 1967

Dr. David K. Archibald today released the first METCO Evaluation Report, which indicates that significant progress was made by elementary students in reading, vocabulary knowledge, and spelling.

An analysis of the information on two standardized tests given six months apart by local teachers showed that the sample of 66 students in grades three through eight gained nine months in reading, thirteen months in spelling and nine months in vocabulary knowledge during the six-month period.

Dr. Archibald explained that, according to national norms, students on the average would be expected to advance only six months during this interval of time, and that these gains are statistically significant, which means it is almost impossible for them to have taken place by chance alone.

Lesser gains were recorded in arithmetic computation -- 7½ months, and arithmetic problem solving -- 6½ months; and these are not enough to be considered statistically significant.

Dr. Archibald stated that the first test showed some 68% of the students to be below grade level in reading and 74% similarly deficient in arithmetic, and that these figures had changed to 58% and 63% respectively.

Joseph E. Killory, the director of METCO, stated that the gain in reading is particularly impressive since the students had previously been falling behind national norms at the estimated rate of one month per year prior to their METCO participation, and that the nine months gain in six months is one and one-half times the anticipated rate of progress. He said, "Reading is basic to all learning and the reversal of the downward trend has virtually closed the gap that existed for the group."

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY
(METCO)

178 HUMBOLDT AVENUE DORCHESTER, MASSACHUSETTS
427-1545

SUMMARY OF
REPORT ON CHANGE IN ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT FOR A SAMPLE OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHILDREN

Dr. David K. Archibald, Director of Research and Evaluation for the METCO Program prepared a detailed report for the U.S. Office of Education. The following pages are a summary of this report.

In September 1967, a "Report on change in Academic Achievement for a Sample of Elementary School Children" was submitted to the U.S. Office of Education. This is a summary of that report.

The Sample

Of the 220 students, 132 were in grades three through eight. Of that number, 66 in three school systems took the Metropolitan Achievement Test as part of their routine school testing.

Of the remaining 66 students in the same grades, 50 were in one school system that administered a different test battery several months along in the school year. For practical reasons it was not possible to have these students tested on either test in the Autumn of 1966. The remaining 16 students were in a fifth system which administered a third achievement battery. Pre and post-test scores were achieved for this sample, but the small sample size militated against including their results with this report.

What are [illegible]

The students in the sample under discussion here were all Negro students from Boston, virtually all of whom had attended Boston schools the previous year and most of whom had never attended school outside of Boston. They were selected for the program on the basis of the following things: ?

1. Volunteer applications, made in most instances by the parents;

2. Minimum limits set as policy for tuition students by the participating school system, to wit, no known serious emotional problems and a certificate of promotion from the most recent school attended;

3. Policy of the METCO Board of Directors that the students as a group represent a broad range of academic ability and economic status.

A very few students were accepted who had not been promoted from the previous year; many more had at one or another time in the past failed to be promoted. Thus, the second criterion should not be taken to mean that only very intelligent or heretofore highly motivated students were selected.

The Instruments

Two kinds of measures were used, the achievement tests referred to above and intelligence tests. In the absence of any better indices of basic ability, IQ is used to provide a rough estimate of the relationship between academic performance and academic ability.

The Metropolitan Achievement Test has separate batteries for grades 3-4, 5-6, and 7-9. Five scales common to all three batteries were selected for this analysis: Word Knowledge (Words), Reading (Rdng), Spelling (Spell), Arithmetic Computation (A. Comp) and Arithmetic Problem-Solving and Concepts (A. Prob). The scale names for the verbal skills are straightforward definitions of the concepts being tested. On the arithmetic scales, A. Comp tests the ability to perform fundamental numerical operations at the given grade level. At the primary level this would include addition, subtraction and the like. The upper grades would have those plus decimals, fractions, graph reading and the like. The A. Prob scale in each battery de-emphasizes computational skills and requires instead the application of arithmetic knowledge to situations requiring reasoning and understanding of the uses of numbers.

The norms for the test come from an age-controlled, nationally stratified sample, which includes, among others, northern urban schools and segregated southern schools, both Negro and white. In all 225 school systems and over 500,000 students were involved in the testing sample. The average IQ of those in the norm sample drawn from this was slightly above 100, due to the elimination from the sample of those who were unusually old for their grade (and presumably in the lower IQ ranges). The norm sample might be expected to have a mean IQ very like that of the METCO sample.

The Distribution of IQ Scores indicates a mean of 102 and a range from 76-127 and measures of skew and kurtosis indicate that the distribution does not differ seriously from the shape of the curve of normal distribution. However, the standard deviation of 10.4, when compared with the national norm s.d. of 16, indicates that the scores are more densely grouped around the mean than would be expected. Thus, rather than 68% of the scores falling between 84 and 116 (+ one s.d. around the mean of 100), 86% of the cases lie in this range. The following table presents the frequencies of IQ scores within ten-point intervals.

IQ FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

Below 81	81-90	91-100	101-110	111-120	Above 120
3%	6%	33%	39%	14%	5%

ACHIEVEMENT TEST INFORMATION

Initial Test Results

All scores for this analysis are indicated in grade equivalent form which means that the students achievement on a test is given the grade level typical of students throughout the nation. For example, a score of 5.2 indicates that this is the score expected of a student in the fifth year, second month of school. The following charts indicates the number of months that the average (mean) score was above or below the national norm.

Scale	Months Above (+) or Below (-) National Norm
Words	-1
Reading	-5
Spelling	0
Arith. Comp.	-5
Arith. Prob.	-6

Test Results Six Months Later

Scale	Months Above (+) or Below (-) National Norm	Net Change
Words	+2	+3
Reading	-2	+3
Spelling	+7	+7
Arith. Comp.	-4	+1
Arith. Prob.	-5	+1

A comparison of the two indicates that during the six month interval the students not only advanced the expected six months in reading but gained an additional three months. Stated differently, the reading scores advanced nine months in six months which is a reversal of the previous tendency of falling behind at an estimated rate of one month per year.

It should be emphasized that the ability of the students (as indicated by I.Q.'s) is at the national norm.

The gains in reading, word knowledge, and spelling are considered to be statistically significant while the gains in arithmetic, though encouraging, are not enough to be so classified.

Per Cent Below National Norm

The percentage of students below national norms on the first test and second test in arithmetic and reading are presented in the following table. Nationally, fifty per cent are below the norm and fifty per cent above.

Initial Test

Scale	Per Cent Below National Norm
Reading	68%
Arith. Comp.	76%
Arith. Prob.	71%

Second Test

Scale	Per Cent Below National Norm	Net Change
Reading	58%	-10%
Arith Comp.	59%	-17%
Arith Prob.	66%	- 5%

Conclusion

It is apparent that a significant degree of progress has taken place during the six month interval between the two tests (Fall 1966 to Spring 1967) in the areas of reading, word knowledge, and spelling. Encouraging, but not significant, progress was present in arithmetic. Other findings about the social adjustment aspects of the program are presently being coded and key punched for future analysis. The high school academic report similar to the elementary one described in this report is nearing completion.

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION PROGRAM

1968 - 69

William J. Genova, Director
METCO -- Research & Evaluation
October 28, 1968

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY
(METCO)
RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
Brookline Town Hall Annex   62 Harvard Street   Brookline, Mass. 02146

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION PROGRAM, 1968 - 1969

October 28, 1968

I. OBJECTIVES OF THE METCO PROGRAM

METCO's broad objective is to provide a quality integrated education for urban children which will reduce or close academic gaps; provide new learning experience for suburban children; and build closer understanding and cooperation between urban and suburban parents and other citizens in the Metropolitan Boston area.

II. THE PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

The purpose of METCO evaluation is explanatory -- to collect and convey information about how well the objectives of the program are being met. A full evaluation results in a story supported by statistics, profiles and examples; it tells what happened. It reveals perceptions and judgments that different groups and individuals hold, obtained by objective means. It tells of merit and shortcoming. If successful, it may offer generalizations for the guidance of subsequent programs.

METCO evaluations benefit both the individual pupil and his parents. Information regarding the achievement of a pupil will be made available to that pupil and his parents in order to provide additional guidance.

A full evaluation should provide information that is valuable to METCO participants, METCO administrators, and to citizens elsewhere. A full evaluation should help people to decide on the future course of METCO, and of similar programs.

III. METCO EVALUATION: 1966-67, 1967-68

To date, large amounts of interview, test, and questionnaire data has been collected from several sources: students, parents, teachers and host families. The analysis of this data is in various stages of completion. The data was to be analyzed to determine the extent to which (1) the students improve academically and are satisfied with their academic situation; (2) they arrive at an acceptable level of social interaction in their new schools; and (3) communication with the white suburban students begins to develop.

During the first year of the METCO program (1966-67), tests conducted with a sampling of 66 elementary grade METCO students indicate significant academic progress. In six months, the students gained nine months in reading, thirteen months in spelling and nine months in vocabulary knowledge. Encouraging but not significant progress was present in arithmetic. The ability of these students (as indicated by I.Q.'s) is at the national norm.

A sociometric analysis has compared the friendship choices of METCO students, other newcomers, and receiving school students. To date, the analysis has shown that although METCO students were significantly lower than their receiving school classmates on popularity indices, they did not score significantly lower than other transfer students.

IV. METCO EVALUATION PROGRAM, 1968-69.

Some of the data to be collected this year will be new, and some of the data to be collected will be extensions of work already in progress.

1. Achievement and School Attitudes

Reading and math achievement tests will be administered to all METCO students, grades two through twelve, both in October and in April. Some of the siblings of these METCO students--a sample of those who still attend Boston schools--will be tested on the same dates. In addition, at the April testing, METCO students and their selected siblings will complete a "classroom climate questionnaire".

The data will be analyzed in a variety of ways. Comparisons will be made of the achievement and school attitudes...

a. of METCO students...

    [1] by grade level
    [2] by sex

b. between METCO students and a sample of their siblings who still attend Boston schools...

    [1] by grade level
    [2] by sex
    [3] regarding change over time

2. Aspirations and Attitudes (toward METCO, integration, etc.)

A questionnaire has been developed and tested which extends previous interview and questionnaire work. This questionnaire will be completed by METCO students and a sample of their siblings who still attend Boston schools, grades seven through twelve.

Analysis of this data will make the same kinds of comparisons as outlined above in (1), Achievement and School Attitudes. In addition, pooled analyses between achievement results and responses to the questionnaire will also be made.

3. Existing Interview and Questionnaire Data; METCO Students, Parents, Teachers, Host Families

The existing interview and questionnaire data represents:

127 ..... METCO student interviews, fall, 1966
113 ..... METCO student questionnaires, June, 1967
85 ..... METCO student interviews, June, 1968
134 ..... METCO parent interviews, spring, 1967
126 ..... METCO parent questionnaires, spring, 1967
300 ..... METCO teacher interviews, winter, 1966
181 ..... Host family questionnaires, spring, 1967

The transcriptions of the interview material and questionnaire responses contain examples of many people's perceptions of METCO. This data will be analyzed by a clinical psychologist in a non-stastical manner. A small group of interviewers will work with the clinical psychologist in analyzing the data; and new interviews will be conducted in order to collect additional information that will either support or question issues and perceptions raised by the existing data. In this manner, we hope to refine our understanding of the effects of METCO on various people.

4. Social Integration via Sociometric Questionnaire

In January, 1967, a sociometric questionnaire was administered to all students in 82 classrooms, grades three through six, among ten schools in two suburban towns near Boston. Subjects of the study were 71 black children from Boston bussed to the schools daily since September, 1966, as part of the METCO program. For comparison purposes, a sample of 115 students who had also entered the same schools the preceding September was identified. As indicators of social adjustment of the METCO children and of communication between them and their classmates, it was asked whether they were significantly different than (a) all other students and (b) other transfer students on measures of popularity and choice-reciprocation. The following conclusions were drawn from the data:

a. While METCO boys are significantly less popular than the Norm, they are still within the range of other transfer boys, who, on the other hand, are not significantly lower than the Norm.

b. While METCO girls are signifantly less popular than the Norm, they are no different from other transfer girls, who are also significantly lower than the Norm.

c. METCO boys and girls, as well as other transfer students, show no differences from the Norm in the percentage of choices reciprocated.

d. METCO boys and girls show no differences from the Norm or from other transfer students in their reciprocal percentages after reciprocal choices with other METCO students are removed.

It was further noted that the lowest scores for METCO students were on the question which asked the names of playmates. Scores were significantly higher on questions about desired seatmates and best friend. The low popularity scores seemed, then, to be more attributable to the factors of nonresidency and newcomer status than to racial identity. It was finally pointed out that these conclusions are preliminary and that a more realistic assessment of METCO social status in the schools would depend on further sociometric data collected periodically over time. During the second year of the METCO program, the sociometric questionnaire was again administered to the same students. A combined analysis of the 1967 and 1968 sociometric data is currently in progress.

5. Local School System Data

Each of the local METCO coordinators in the twenty-seven receiving communities is being asked to record independently events that they either observe or hear about regarding METCO. <Each METCO coordinator is being asked to write a report based on his records, regarding the METCO experience in his community.> Guidelines for the systematic collection of data are provided for the local METCO coordinators.

6. Exceptional Cases Study

A small number of METCO students have been referred to the Judge Baker Guidance Center for psychological testing. It is proposed that a study of these students be undertaken in order to determine...

a. which of these students have validated psychological problems.

b. how much of their psychological problems were either caused by or precipitated by participation in the METCO program.

c. what further screening procedures are suggested by this study.

7. Study of METCO Communities

It is proposed that studies of the METCO communities be made in order to determine: How METCO got started. Who provided the leadership. Where did support and opposition come from. What decisions were made to expand the program. What possible side-effects has METCO had.

Two proposals for community studies are presently under consideration.

V. FINAL METCO EVALUATION REPORT

A METCO evaluation report will be finished by 30 June 1969. This report will cover the three-year period (1966-1969) of the METCO program. Each of the evaluation program areas referred to in this paper will comprise a chapter in the final report. We plan to disseminate this report to interested groups throughout the country.

September of 1966 saw over two hundred children and youth from Boston's "inner city" board buses which were to carry them to a totally new educational experience in suburban schools - an experience that would engender new friendships, encourage new dialogue and provide the opportunity to eliminate or reduce the academic gap which would otherwise be a lifetime handicap.

This report is dedicated to these young people, the more than two hundred who joined them in September of 1967, and their parents in recognition of their extra effort to obtain that which should be their birthright.

The Metropolitan Council
for
Educational Opportunity
(METCO)

OFFICERS

President - Leon Trilling

1st Vice President - Paul Parks

2nd Vice President - Mrs. Jerome B. Wiesner

Secretary - Mrs. Warren H. Haussler

Treasurer - Charles P. Harris

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Charles E. Brown
Mrs. Eric T. Clarke
George Hill
Mrs. Hubert E. Jones
Mrs. John A. Keil, Jr.
Mrs. Herbert O. LeVine
Miss Elma Lewis
Mrs. Richard G. Mintz
David R. Sargent
Mrs. Michael Stein

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Executive Director - Joseph E. Killory

Associate Director - Mrs. Ruth M. Batson

Staff Assistant - Mrs. Elizabeth G. Johnson

RESEARCH STAFF*

Director of Research - David K. Archibald

*Funded under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

FORWARD

This interim report is prepared for the Carnegie Corporation who, in partnership with the U. S. Office of Education, made METCO possible. The narrative will be made available to other urban centers with the hope that the seed will "fall on fertile soil" and that others can share the satisfaction that has been ours.

It should be noted that the funds provided by the U. S. Office of Education are under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (P.L. 89-10) which seeks innovative and/or exemplary ways of attacking persistent problems. There is little question that METCO meets these criteria. Unlike research projects which require "control" and "experimental" groups, METCO is an operational project which, in harmony with the 1954 Supreme Court decision and the 1967 U. S. Commission on Civil Rights recommendations, presupposes that a quality, integrated education is vital for children living in a multi-racial nation and world.

METCO is not THE plan: nor is there one on any drawing board; it is A plan which provides a tangible program for some, a spark of hope for others, and a potential vehicle for future, related programs.

METCO by its very grass-roots nature has demonstrated that suburban communities are concerned with the national problem which, while urban associated, transcends urban boundaries in both cause and solution. Because of their participation suburban citizens reap a harvest of benefits - stereotypes disappear as children study and play together, insights are gained as mothers discuss their common interest - children. Respect and understanding replace fear and myth as the level of communication increases between Negroes and whites and between city and suburb.

Not unlike the proverbial pebble that is dropped in the ocean, METCO may cause ripples which will carry to undreamed of shores.

The Metropolitan Council
for
Educational Opportunity
(METCO)

OFFICERS

President - Leon Trilling

1st Vice President - Paul Parks

2nd Vice President - Mrs. Jerome B. Wiesner

Secretary - Mrs. Warren H. Haussler

Treasurer - Charles P. Harris

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Charles E. Brown
Mrs. Eric T. Clarke
George Hill
Mrs. Hubert E. Jones
Mrs. John A. Keil, Jr.
Mrs. Herbert O. LeVine
Miss Elma Lewis
Mrs. Richard G. Mintz
David R. Sargent
Mrs. Michael Stein

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Executive Director - Joseph E. Killory

Associate Director - Mrs. Ruth M. Batson

Staff Assistant - Mrs. Elizabeth G. Johnson

RESEARCH STAFF*

Director of Research - David K. Archibald

*Funded under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

CONTENTS

I. The Program: An Overview -1-

II. Support and Opposition -2-

III. Community Participation -21-

IV. Chronology of Development -23-

V. Host Families -27-

VI. Evaluation -29-

VII. Present and the Future -36-

THE PROGRAM: AN OVERVIEW

METCO is a nonprofit organization which is providing 425 urban children and youth, the predominance of whom are Negro, with the opportunity to be educated in sixteen of the several cities and towns surrounding Boston. The students are from the Roxbury, North Dorchester, and South End sections of Boston in which most of the city's Negro citizens reside and which, for convenience sake, will be referred to throughout this report as Roxbury.

The participants, all full-time students, are found at all levels from kindergarten through grade twelve, and it is the intent of all associated with METCO that the children complete their public school education (grade 12) in their new school system if funds are available.

All of the students are volunteers and they carry with them a variety of academic, socio-economic, and family backgrounds. Their applications were sought by announcements in the public media with special emphasis on a radio station and newspaper that cater to Roxbury residents. In addition, letters were sent to seventy-six churches offering spakers and information, and a meeting was held in Roxbury for community, organizational, social agency, and civil rights workers to explain the program and solicit their assistance in seeking applicants. No formal recruiting was done the second year.

Mrs. Ruth M. Batson, Associate Director and Mrs. Elizabeth G. Johnson, Staff Assistant, interviewed all parents as well as the older students before recommending names to the school authorities with whom responsibility for final acceptance rests. Since METCO is not in a position of authority over the participating systems, this procedure was necessary.

This voluntary relationship is one of the great strengths of the program. The METCO staff which is funded by the Carnegie Corporation is able to coordinate the program by serving as an agent for increased communication between parents and the schools and as a resource center for parents, students, teachers and administrators who seek counsel or information concerning any aspect of the program.

Additionally, the METCO staff is equipped to provide logistic help for the Newton Public Schools, the recipient of the Federal grant, in planning the involved transportation routes, servicing transportation problems, and coordinating research. It also provides a point of contact for METCO host families, Roxbury community committees, the Roxbury METCO council, and suburban community committees.

The unusual blending of public and private funds has made possible the unique relationship which METCO and the public school systems enjoy. It provides a unified approach with a single center of communications.

*Arlington - 15
*Braintree - 20
*Brookline - 97
*Lexington - 25
*Lincoln - 18

*Newton - 75
*Wellesley - 50
Marblehead - 20
Sharon - 25
Walpole - 16

Weston - 9
Westwood - 9
Framingham - 9
Needham - 9
Reading - 8

Concord-Carlisle Regional High School - 20

*Original Seven

II

SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION

METCO is an action program which has drawn attention, support, and applause from a host of individuals and groups.

Parents and Children form the most important group involved in the program and their support is literally the sine qua non of the program. Interviews with parents of the participating students are currently being conducted and to date all have indicated their desire to have their child continue in the program. Many parents have indicated a desire to have brothers and sisters of their METCO student participate next year.

During the interviews, one mother indicated that her child's nervousness had calmed down. Another said that her child would "just die" if he doesn't go back. And still another described her delight with the program by asking, "Can you imagine a child going out of the door singing at ten minutes of seven?" Further examples are found in a paragraph taken from a report of Mrs. Batson to the METCO Board of Directors.

> "The reaction to the program from both parents and students has been for the most part favorable. Many parents report great improvement in the attitude of their children toward school. For example: one parent said that his son, who was absent a good deal last year, because of 'illness,' has not missed one day of school this year. This is in spite of the fact that last year his school was across the street from his home and this year the boy must board a bus at 7:10 a.m. A mother reports that last year her son would have crying spells as the time for school approached, while this year he gets up eagerly and 'can't wait to get to school.' One high school boy who was late for school 27 times last year has not missed one day of school and to date has been late once. Another mother writes in a letter about her son - 'he's far from genius, however, there is a definite pattern and direction that makes me as a parent relieved.'"

Governmental Leaders have voiced their approval of the program as indicated the series of letters sent in response to a request for their reactions to the program.

March 21, 1967

Dear Mr. Killory:

Thank you for your letter giving me an opportunity to express my complete support for METCO. I do so enthusiastically and without qualification. It has had my endorsement from the very start and will continue to have it. You and your associates deserve commendation and complete support for your splendid efforts. I wish you all the best.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Edward W. Brooke

March 17, 1967

Dear Mr. Killory:

I received your letter of March 9th and I appreciate hearing of the activities of the Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity.

I have always been an enthusiastic supporter of those educational projects which would mitigate cultural disadvantages and assure quality education to all our children.

The Greater Boston Area is dotted with demonstration projects and special programs which serve as models for improving the quality and availability of educational and cultural opportunities for all our citizens.

The school environment of a child is recognized as an important factor contributing not only to his educational attainments, but to his growth as an individual.

Simple justice and our national principles call on all of us to support and provide the quality of education that the students and the times demand.

I wish to commend those of you who have taken on the responsibilities of leadership in the drive to give all Americans equal opportunity and to provide excellence in education.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

/s/ John W. McCormack

March 23, 1967

TO THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

With deep personal pleasure I can report to you that my reaction to the Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity is one of genuine satisfaction and delight.

From METCO, which I wholeheartedly endorse, Massachusetts' citizens and America's educators are deriving great benefit. Because of METCO, seven communities are assisting the City of Boston in complying with this Commonwealth's and the nation's first law requiring the elimination of racial imbalance in public schools. This project is, therefore, preventing thousands of pupils, both white and non-white, from being injured by the psychological and educational harms of segregated schools and classrooms, which are totally unrepresentative of our multi-racial cosmopolitan and urban centered society.

METCO's research results will give public officials and educators invaluable information about the effects of integration on pupils' development and achievement, and will produce objective evaluations of urban-suburban approaches to the enormous task of preparing our youth for tomorrow's world.

With confidence I can say that METCO has fulfilled the expectations which its supporters and I had in mind when I proudly signed Chapter 506 of the Acts of 1966. This law permits and authorizes state financial aid for the attendance of children in public schools of cities and towns other than those in which they reside in order to achieve more racially balanced classrooms.

On behalf of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I commend the Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity and its associates for their excellent work and extend my best personal wishes for the program's continued success.

Sincerely,

/s/ John A. Volpe
(Governor of the Commonwealth)

April 4, 1967

Dear Mr. Killory:

It is with great pleasure that I accept the opportunity to comment on the METCO program.

In my view, METCO directs itself to the achievement of a whole series of vital and related goals - equal educational opportunities for all children regardless of the accident of geography, integrated education, and the growing awareness between the suburbs and the core city that their interest are deeply related, that their problems are largely in common, and that the solutions to these problems require a coordinated effort.

State government in Massachusetts has made three critical contributions to the METCO program:

First, the Commonwealth provided the funds to support the blue ribbon study, the so-called Kiernan Commission, which made the recommendation for the elimination of racial imbalance, and generated the broad public interest in the possible legislative solution to the problem.

Second, Governor Volpe proposed and the Legislature enacted in 1965 the first legislation in the country to eliminate racial imbalance in the public schools. This bill was the result of tremendous effort on the part of interested citizens' groups, proponents in the Legislature and our Administration during the summer of 1965. It was also a reflection of considerable public understanding generated, in part, by support from the media of communication..

Third, in the summer of 1966 the Legislature enacted what became Chapter 506 of the Acts of 1966. This Bill provided the legal sanction for the METCO program and focused attention on the possibility of broader experiments in metropolitan education.

In these three instances, state government served, at the same time, as focal point, initiator, catalyst, technician and even student. Even in the most forward-looking circles in Massachusetts the concepts underlying our Racial Imbalance Act and Chapter 506 were not totally understood or accepted at the time these measures were being discussed in the halls of government. This discussion focused the attention of interested people on these issues, enabled us in government to understand the basic principles involved and relate to them in a meaningful way, and provided the forum from which public understanding could develop and grow.

It is my belief that METCO is but a start - that signigicant success and public acceptance in the past months has demonstrated a new awareness of the three goals goals I mentioned above.

In closing, I would like to add my own personal support for the METCO program and the concepts underlying it. I hope it will become a model both for broader acceptance in Massachusetts and for similar action throughout the country.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

/s/ Elliot L. Richardson
(Attorney General-Commonwealth of Massachusetts)

---

4 April 1967

Dear Mr. Killory:

The program of the Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity has done an outstanding job in promoting the democratic ideal of equality of educational opportunity for all Americans.

Never has the work it is now doing been more necessary. At a time when man's knowledge is becoming broader and technology more common, the need for educational opportunity is obvious.

METCO is striving to fulfill that need for those to whom it has often been only a hope. It has made, and I am sure, will continue to make a praiseworthy contribution to our country's total effort in this direction.

Very truly yours,

/s/ MAURICE A DONAHUE
President of the Senate

April 11, 1967

Dear Mrs. Batson:

I am writing to you at this time to give my impressions about the operation of METCO after its first year.

It would appear to me that METCO has lived up to all of the expectations that they had for it when the enabling Legislation was signed into law.

I hope that more and more school committees and superintendents will see the wisdom of sharing their educational resources so that we might provide a first-class education for all of our children.

Sincerely,

/s/ Senator Kevin B. Harrington
SENATE MAJORITY FLOOR LEADER

May 4, 1967

Dear Mr. Killory:

The first year of METCO's endeavors will soon be completed. I take this opportunity to express my interest and support of the program's endeavors.

The late President Kennedy, when serving as a member of the National House of Representatives, had the occasion to express his political creed. He stated, "I want a better life for every American. I want to see every American walk with his head up......secure as far as possible against misfortunes not of his own making.....and confident that he can provide his children with opportunities for a fuller and more useful life."

The challenge and promise of METCO is certainly in tune with the creed of our late President. The bridges of communications which METCO has begun to open between our suburbs and the central city are encouraging. If we as a people sincerely desire to nurture a mutual interest in the educational and social needs of all our peoples then this beginning, and its implications of communities sharing a concern for the burdens of their neighbors and fellow citizens, is commendable.

I am very happy to endorse the program, its goals and its spirit.

Very truly yours,

s/ ROBERT H. QUINN
HOUSE MAJORITY LEADER

Further indication of the support which the program enjoys is found in the fact that the Massachusetts' Legislature passed and Governor Volpe signed an Act (Chapter 506 of the Acts of 1966) which provides that a school committee of any town may adopt a plan for attendance in that town of children residing in other towns (cities) in which racial imbalance exists. This was submitted on behalf of the Massachusetts Federation for Fair Housing and Equal Rights and it became known as the "METCO Bill."

The Massachusetts Department of Education under the direction of Dr. Owen B. Kiernan, the Commissioner of Education, has been a partner in the METCO program since the idea was first conceived.

At a meeting in November 1965, Dr. Thomas B. Curtin, Deputy Commissioner of Education and one of the original directors of METCO, urged participation of suburban communities. This was one of the meetings from which METCO sprang. The State Board of Education not only approved of METCO, but it also granted a leave of absence from his duties with the department to METCO's Executive Director.

The continuing support of METCO by the State Department of Education is noted in this Boston Globe article of February 20, 1967 and the letter that follows it.

> "Owen B. Kiernan, State Education Commissioner called the Commission's (U. S. Civil Rights Commission) findings, 'an affirmation of the Kiernan Report,' a state study that pointed out the harmful effects of racial imbalance. He suggested that U. S. aid could take three forms - operations (teacher salaries and instructional materials), transportation and school construction. He said Federal money could also expand the METCO plan, under which Negro students are bused from the city to suburban schools."

It should be noted that the "Kiernan Report" is the Report of the Advisory Committee on Racial Imbalance and Education which was appointed by the Board of Education of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The report was a major factor leading to the passage of the Massachusetts law, Chapter 641, which calls for the elimination of racial imbalance, and which in turn laid the foundation for METCO.

Copies of this report may be obtained from the Massachusetts Department of Education, 182 Tremont Street, Boston.

March 22, 1967

Dear Mr. Killory:

When the Advisory Committee on Racial Imbalance recommended to the Commonwealth's Board of Education in April of 1965 the encouragement of voluntary efforts by cities and towns to overcome racial isolation, its members affirmed their belief in equal educational opportunity and acknowledged the validity of the idea that separation of white and nonwhite children in a multi-racial society is detrimental to adequate training for the duties of citizenship. Statements take on new stature, however, when they lead to a course of action which justifies and fulfills the expectation of its authors. METCO has more than satisfied this invitation to innovate; it has become a source of inspiration in terms of how voluntary leadership, backed by professional skill and a sense of civic purpose, can affect the lives of hundreds of children and effect mass attitudinal changes in an entire metropolitan area. This Department is proud to have had some part in METCO's origin and to have contributed to its leadership by virtue of your participation as its executive officer.

The "action research" which has been developed to date, relative to the impact of METCO, has given support to the theories that nonwhite children are motivated to greater learning achievement by attending school with white children, that the aspiration level of nonwhite children is raised, and that the white children involved not only sustain, if not raise, their academic achievement rate, but also acquire valuable insights pertaining to a subculture they never really knew before. Far more important than any of these advantages, however, is the humanizing effect this program has brought about. There is marked evidence that pupils, teachers, and many citizens of the participating communities have achieved degrees of human dignity and mutual respect which merits the continuation and broadening of the rich experiment in learning and living. The Department will be pleased to cooperate in your achieving this new goal.

Yours very sincerely,

/s/ Owen B. Kiernan
Commissioner of Education

The NAACP's president of the Boston Branch, Mr. Kenneth I. Guscott endorsed METCO as reported in the Boston Traveler on November 18, 1966 and in the letter that follows.

> "NAACP Leader Speaks on Busing - 'Somewhere along the line, we have to let people learn about each other and how to live together. That way, in the long run, we will have a better America than we have today.' With these words, Mr. Guscott congratulated Braintree for its participation in the METCO busing program. He spoke before the PTA at East Junior High School last night."

March 23, 1967

Dear Mr. Killory:

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to add my endorsement (to the many I know you must have) of the METCO program.

We are in a position at our office to hear from many parents. To us their satisfaction and their comments on the changes they see in curriculum, extracurricula activities, and attitude towards school leaves us with the desire for more children to have the opportunity to participate in this program.

I fill many speaking engagements in the suburban communities. The majority of comments I receive in these areas are positive and reflect the fact that suburban parents feel very strongly that they too are beneficiaries of METCO.

With good wishes,

/s/ Kenneth I. Guscott, President
Boston Branch
National Association for the
Advancement of Colored People

School Superintendents historically have established the educational "climate" in their school systems and their positive implementation of METCO has been of significant importance. It goes without saying that the superintendent must have direction and support from his school committee and in all cases this has been present; in Wellesley, the early stand taken in the face of opposition proved vital to the entire program.

Letters containing the observations of the participating superintendents are presented here with the hope that their counterparts in other sections of the country may explore similar courses of action.

March 8, 1967

Dear Mr. Killory:

Since September of 1966, through the invitation of the Lincoln Public Schools, ten kindergarten children from educationally underprivileged areas in the Boston area have been participating in Lincoln's school program under the auspices of METCO.

This is perhaps an opportune time to draw some early observations relative to the success of the METCO educational program in Lincoln which has had the full support of the Lincoln School Committee.

Prior to the start of the school year, we had some concern regarding the youngsters' physical condition after a bus ride of some twenty miles. The distance proved to be no handicap to the childrens' scholastic activity.

I do not believe it is necessary to convince a person with your background of the educational values accrued in a suburban school system such as Lincoln. the citizenry demands and gets quality education. It is to this kind of school environment that the METCO pupils are exposed. I believe that the Lincoln Schools have much to offer the METCO youngsters in the enhancement of their educatinnal experiences. For instance, Lincoln offers a highly desirable pupil-teacher ratio with much individualized attention, a library and full-time librarian, specialists and consultants in science, reading and math, etc.

The most important aspect of this program has been the mutually beneficial experiences shared by the Lincoln and Roxbury (METCO) children this year. This has shown that an integrated school situation is aiding in creating an exciting educational environment for children. We regard this as an opportunity for children who are residents of Lincoln to come to know children with other backgrounds and environments as well. It is also an opportunity to widen the horizons of the Lincoln children beyond the borders of their own town.

On behalf of the Lincoln School Department, we extend special appreciation and many thanks, through you, to the Stern Family Fund, Carnegie Foundation and any private donors who made METCO possible for Lincoln.

Sincerely,

/s/ Robert Filbin
Superintendent of Schools
(Lincoln Public Schools)

February 27, 1967

Dear Mr. Killory:

Our general impression of METCO in this community, after almost 6 months of operation, is most favorable. The School Committee, teachers and administrators feel that both the METCO pupils and our pupils are gaining a great deal from this experience. The METCO pupils are being exposed to smaller classes and more individual attention and our pupils seem to be learning that Negroes are individuals and not stereotypes. We also note that the elements in this community which were hostile to this program previously, have quieted down and are reluctantly accepting METCO. In the forthcoming School Committee election, METCO is not an issue.

A very significant aspect of METCO is the excellent relationship between the pupil, his parents and the host families, in whose homes pupils obtain their lunch. Some real friendships have developed between the Negro and white families.

It is our observation that, for the most part, the Negro children have been accepted by the other children and respond to their friendship. We have had two incidents of "name calling" but that was handled very well by the teachers involved. The Negro children involved seemed to feel enough support so that they were able to handle themselves with considerable dignity.

The METCO parents, so far, have attended P.T.A. functions in the school and seem very pleased with the education being offered their children.

Our teachers only complaint is that these pupils are not sufficiently prepared for their grade level and need a good deal of extra help. Individual tutoring is taking place presently, with about a third of our METCO pupils. We hope to involve many of them in our summer remedial program, if transportation can be provided.

The only area in which we are having some difficulty is in transportation, whereby the bus might be very late or skip a school on pickup. In time, we expect this will be resolved.

You and your staff have been most cooperative and this has made the whole program operate smoothly and efficiently. We are particularly grateful to Mrs. Batson who has made herself available for help at all times and who has been most frank, forthright and honest with us. This we appreciate.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Bert A. Roens
Superintendent of Schools
(Arlington Public Schools)

March 21, 1967

Dear Mr. Killory:

Here in Brookline, we are most enthusiastic about the METCO program. As you know, the idea of METCO was conceived by a group of Brookline citizens who were interested in civil rights and who wanted to do more than just talk about these rights. The idea became an actuality in the spring of 1966. Dr. Leon Trilling, the president of METCO, is a member of the Brookline School Committee and has children in our school system.

Brookline has 73 METCO students. There are 23 in the High School, grades 9-11, and 50 in the grade schools, kindergarten through grade 7. Two of these children are white; the others are Negro.

The program is working well. There are problems as there are with all new-comers to a school system. These problems can be and are being solved. In fact, we are learning through our experience with the METCO program how we can better benefit all transfer students. There is need for future curriculum revision, and for the study of integrated texts.

Last spring and at the beginning of this school year, there was apprehension on the part of some teachers and students, but after the initial admission of the group, this anxiety dissipated. Teachers are reacting to the METCO student in many ways from permissive to authoritarian, but action nevertheless has been positive and productive.

The developmental skills of the METCO children's earlier years, which were not mastered and which have caused gaps in their educational achievement, are being re-attacked. The services of our reading and health specialists as well as of our adjustment and guidance counselors, are being utilized in addition to the extra help given by the subject teachers. Students and school personnel have become more progressively aware that these differences in educational opportunity existed and must be bridged. Gradual though it may be, the school program is focusing upon producing this change. METCO students report that they are learning more, learning better, and learning easily.

METCO has demonstrated to the resident students the richness of this new group's culture. The students are involved in activities together, thereby benefitting from confronting and engaging in a different cultural milieu. The dialogue and the communication between both groups have been lively, exciting, and meaningful. The new students have been assimilated in the general school population in the extracurricular activities--athletics, music, art, drama--and the talents of their heritage are pronounced.

Some adults in the community have been relieved of early skepticism. A candidate for the School Committee running against the METCO program was soundly defeated. The community on the whole appreciates the validity of the program for Brookline children as well as for the METCO youngsters. Better feeling about the differences in people has been effected in part.

Dr. Sperber
Page 2
March 21, 1967

The moral aspect cannot be overlooked. Racial imbalance in schools impairs the confidence of Negro children, restricts their aspirations, lowers their motivation, encourages prejudice and presents to white children an inaccurate picture of a democratic society. In an integrated educational program, a more exact picture of life is presented to both Negro and white children and prepares both for a multi-racial community and world.

In our technological society, it is imperative that we offer a sound education to all children, irrespective of race, in order to prepare them for the professional and vocational needs of our world today and of the world of the future.

The expansion of the program is contemplated. If it must be limited, it will be only because of physical facilities rather than the sociological and psychological factors.

Very sincerely yours,

/s/ Robert I. Sperber
Superintendent of Schools
(Brookline Public Schools)

Mr. William Young, superintendent of Schools in Braintree indicated via a telephone message that he considers the program to be "perfectly successful." The Braintree and the Roxbury students in his opinion have benefitted from the experience and all have adjusted very well to the program.

March 23, 1967

Dear Mr. Killory:

I have been most gratified by our experience in Wellesley as a participant in the METCO project. As an early supporter of the idea of bringing students into the suburbs, I have seen my aspirations for a successful and valuable experiment exceeded. The prompt action of the Wellesley School Committee to extend its involvement is a tribute to the outstanding performance of the Wellesley Senior High School staff and the community support of the undertaking. I look forward to another exciting year for METCO.

Sincerely yours,

John B. Chaffee
Superintendent
s/ (Wellesley Public Schools)

October 6, 1967

Dear Mr. Killory:

The Lexington Public Schools participated in METCO during the 1966-67 school year by educating 25 junior high school pupils from the Boston Public Schools. All of the reactions that I have received from parents, our teachers, counsellors, and administrators lead me to conclude that these students were successfully assimilated both academically and socially into our schools. We were so pleased with the program that the school committee voted to accept additional pupils for 1967-68. We are presently awaiting notice from the State Department of Education on the funding for these additional students.

In summary, I am personally satisfied with our first year results and sincerely hope that we can continue to be a part of this most important project.

Very truly yours,

s/ Rudolph J. Fobert
Superintendent
(Lexington Public Schools)

School Principals are key people in any program as are the teachers. The efforts of the principals of the twenty-eight schools have been a major factor in METCO's success. The reactions of a few are included here as an indication of the feelings of the entire group as is a quote from the Quincy Patriot Ledger, dated December 15, 1966 under the caption "Negro Busing Highly Successful Say Junior High School Principals."

> "The attendance of 20 Negro Grade 7 and 8 students from the Roxbury area at the South and East junior high schools has been a 'highly successful experience to date,' say the principals of the two schools. Albert Avitable, principal of South Junior High School, and John H. Crowell, principal of East Junior High, said that the program, launched by the Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity (METCO) in September, is working smoothly and efficiently as far as the Braintree schools are concerned."

March 10, 1967

Dear Mr. Killory:

This letter will probably run somewhat stream-of-conscience as I've had good intentions about it up to now and I want to cover more than just your report request. Miss Ellis and Mrs. Wersel shared their thoughts with me and what came out of this meeting will be sort of a group of feelings rather than findings.

As a person-to-person project we feel strongly that METCO has been very successful, or at least has made a good start. As previously reported there has been amazingly little negative reaction on the part of children or adults, Negro or white. The METCO parents have cooperated in every respect. There appears to be genuine acceptance on the part of the resident population (that segment through whom we have school contacts). The host families have worked fine, and we at last received two additional volunteers for host parents. All parties take joint part in school and P.T.A. activities. I was most impressed by the supper put on for us by the METCO parents at Freedom House for the Arlington group. Further, Carolyn and I were much moved by the act of all the Arlington METCO parents contributing to a memorial for Steven at Pratt Diagnostic Clinic.*

We feel that the contact with METCO parents and children will, and has, forced some of our own parents and children for the first time to look critically at some of the typically negative stereotypes concerning Negroes. Such statements that usually start with "all Negroes are ______." Also, many people will no longer be able to feel that something that happens in Roxbury or North Dorchester is of no importance or doesn't concern them. For many this "involvement" is marginal. We hope it grows to conscious concern and compassion.

We have some doubts and concerns about our academic or school program. What special projects, efforts, etc., need we take to bridge the gap between our respective sub-cultures, orientations and the dilemma of city vs. suburban living? Three of the children (by our standards) have serious scholastic deficiencies. Tutoring is too recent to evaluate properly at this time, but we feel it will need to be a long term process--probably several years. When I broached the subject of lack of emphasis on the Negro's contribution to our history and culture,

*Mr. McLean's son died suddenly in February.

the teachers countered somewhat that they (the teachers) felt that this particular group of children appeared to have little knowledge or concern for their ethnic history. The teachers felt that the children also lacked experience in making good use of spare time such as "help" sessions, and while waiting for buses. Some of the children's experience and interest in some areas--travel, for example, seem quite limited.

In order to make better use of our teaching talents, our facilities and provide a better program of interchange or exchange would it be possible to do something on the line of the following:

1. pretest or pre-estimate more accurately the correct grade placement of children in the receiving schools.

2. have sociologist, social workers or persons who have experience in education, race relations, etc., offer some guide lines or suggested ways in which we can bridge the gap.

3. in a manner similar to (2) advise us how we can use the presence of these METCO children to increase interracial understanding, overcome prejedice, and make everyone feel natural and secure in our new situation. How can we make this also a "cultural exchange?"

4. should there be some kind of sharing of experiences between not only the participating schools, but also with schools in the core city?

As for a thumbnail evaluation at this time, I think we have made a good start. For those children who stick with us for the total 5-12 grade program I think we have a great deal to offer. I am optimistic that we can move from a point of public passive resistance or indifference to one of active participation and acceptance over the course of seven years. I don't feel there is any magic in this, but conscientious planning and hard work can carry the day.

In closing may we thank you for your kind letter concerning Steven. Also, for your continuing guidance and support for this very worthy METCO project.

Sincerely,

/s/ Harold McLean,
(Principal -Cutter School -Arlington)

March 2, 1967

Dear Mr. Killory:

The placement of eight 7th grade students and two 8th grade METCO students in East Junior High School has proven to be a very successful venture.

While the achievement of these students is not exceptional, it is interesting to note that for the most part, they have made excellent records in conduct and effort.

A 7th grade boy, _______ ________, was elected to represent his homeroom on the Student Council. Interestingly enough, _______ nominated himself and his classmates regarded him highly enough to elect him.

_______ _________, an 8th grader, became a regular member of the varsity football team and a member of the Junior Varsity basketball team. This entailed spending time at afternoon practices and trips on public transportation with arrival at his home about 6:30 P.M.

Some of the METCO students have had to be dropped from French when they were unable to maintain a proper standard. This was probably due to a different background of preparation from our students rather than lack of effort.

None of these students has been involved in any incident which would call for serious disciplinary measures. Arrangements were made for transportation for those desiring to stay for extra help or makeup work on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays.

A number of METCO parents have attended our P.T.A. Meetings and Parent Conference programs. The parents have tended to be very cooperative with the school.

Host families have generally been very good about taking responsibilities where children have planned to stay for occasional after-school activities or in cases where METCO students have missed their buses.

The record of attendance of our METCO students has been very commendable. One girl had perfect attendance the first two terms. The largest number of absences for the first two terms was only seven and the average number of absences for the first half-year was a mere three.

Placing these students in proper groupings poses somewhat of a problem for us since we had very little background information to go by. Most were placed in "middle of the road" groups where their achievement is about average. Two of the three placed in above-average groups have maintained better than average achievement.

Very truly yours,

/s/ John H. Crowell
(Principal -East Jr. High -Braintree)

March 10, 1967

Dear Mr. Killory:

Here at Countryside we have eleven children from Boston who are enrolled in the METCO program. From the beginning, we have felt that these children are adjusting very well to a new and different school situation. They have established good relationships with teachers and children and have become very much a part of our school "family." One child has needed and is receiving help academically and in social adjustment. In general their achievement falls into the average range and they are able to hold their own in average and low average groupings. Their greatest need appears to be in developing good independent work habits. Looking back we can see a steady improvement in this area.

They seem to be happy in their surroundings here as evidenced in their open and friendly manner. Indeed, in investigating noisy voices in the foyer one day, I found that the base of the argument was whose teacher was the "best" teacher!.. While waiting for the bus each day they are eager to share with me their experiences and successes during the day.

We are fortunate in having a group of parents who are truly interested and are doing a fine job as host families. Most of them wish to continue next year with the same child. In only one or two cases has the relationship been at all strained. In some cases very close ties have been formed.

I do not mean to infer that all of these youngsters are little "angels" and that the program has proceeded without a hitch. However, the teachers maintain that these children, for the most part, fit into the normal pattern of behavior in the classroom. Then, too, there have been some difficulties in implementation mostly in the area of communication. Appointment of a member of the central staff here in the city to serve as liaison person has reduced considerably the excessive number of calls on the principals time.

All in all, the program at Countryside has been successful in my opinion.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Anne Fahy
(Principal - Countryside School - Newton)

March 13, 1967

Dear Mr. Killory:

It is now the first of March, approximately six months after our initial experience with our nine METCO children. Looking back everything went along fairly smoothly for a new program. After all, in any new venture we can expect some challenges to arise which have to be ironed out.

As I have mentioned previously We have nine youngsters in the program: three in grade three, four in grade five, and two in grade six. Eight of the nine have made the adjustment rather quickly. One of our older girls in sixth grade has been through quite a difficult struggle! We have hired a counselor-tutor on a five meetings a week basis, but it has not been going on long enough for us to pass any judgment at this time.

Volunteer tutors are helping five children with math and reading on a once a week basis. This seems to be working very nicely!

The "Newton Friend" arrangement, I believe has been more successful than we dared to imagine. The informal, relaxed atmosphere in which these children play and eat is conducive to sharing ideas, gaining new friends, and breaking down any previous misconceptions. On numberous occasions parents have been on the phone between Roxbury and Newton attempting to make arrangements for someone to stay over night.

Our P.T.A. meetings have always drawn a good percentage of the adults from Roxbury. Actually a higher percentage than from Newton.

The parent-teacher conferences have been held in the Williams School with parents from Roxbury forming car pools or "Newton Friends" arranging the transportation. These conferences were usually held in regard to interpreting the Newton report card which was quite different from Boston's. I have heard nothing but praise from the involved parties.

The problem areas primarily concerned the research, the daily transportation and the teachers need to thoroughly understand the internal feelings of the METCO children.

The first problem, I hope, was solved when the Newton Principals went to Dr. Brown and asked for some assistence in forming ground rules because our teachers were being asked to spend too much time out of the classroom and appointments were not being kept.

The second problem, of transportation, will always be a challenge because it calls for coordination of so many unpredictable elements such as children, adults and motor vehicles. For example, all of the children are to arrive at the Hyde School from the various schools in time to meet a bus which leaves at four. The taxis all seem to arrive at different times and sometimes the bus is late. Who supervises these children when they arrive at the Hyde School? Should the principal and the staff have to do this?

The final problem was the largest headache because it was probably more vital to the success of the program than any other issue. How could the teachers help each METCO child have a successful classroom experience, especially when the pupils recited in class? We felt that continual negative responses could cause a child a great deal of inner frustration and general unhappiness. First of all, we had to have an understanding of the internal feelings of each child. The child was in no position to help us because when I talked with them I got no where and there were no records. It was decided to call in Mrs. Jones, a person who had gone through a similar experience in New York City. We found this discussion most helpful. Also the parents offered suggestions which certainly guided us.

It is important to note here that all of the teachers feel deeply towards these children and have continually been trying new schemes in hopes of insuring success.

Each of our nine boys and girls has his own personality which is coming through stronger everyday. We are very pleased to have them in our Williams School family.

Yours very truly,

/s/ Merton C. Tefft, Jr.,
Principal
(Williams School - Auburndale)

March 22, 1967

Dear Mr. Killory:

My reaction to the METCO program is wholly favorable. I endorse it wholeheartedly and hope to see it continue.

The effect, as was envisaged, has been beneficial to both the METCO students and the Brookline students.

The METCO students appear to be profiting from the experience educationally as well as personally. They have had problems to overcome in adjusting to a new and large school and are rising to the challenge.

The students who are Boookline residents have benefited by having more Negro students in their classes. The rethinking regarding inter-racial relationship of many students who are Brookline residents has been wholesome and, in my opinion, necessary. The whole concept of the responsibility of each community to do what it can to help solve problems of adjacent communities has been too long dormant. The METCO program is looked on now with pride both personally as well as for the community by a majority of our students and faculty as a step in the right direction.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Bertram H. Holland
Headmaster
(Brookline High School)

March 10, 1967

Dear Mr. Killory:

Enclosed is my report on the METCO Program as I have viewed it operating in my school.

Nine METCO children enrolled in the school in September, 1966. They are currently members of the first, fourth and sixth grades. They have adjusted well to their change of schools and reflect totally their parents' commitment to education which enrolled them in the program.

The academic acheivement of the children is within the range of their classmates who are neighborhood children. The older METCO children have become members of our school choir and orchestra and our afternoon play program. They have demonstrated as great a capacity as their classmates to become involved in a class project or a playground hassle. They are as eager as their classmates to establish confidences with their teachers or to participate in the extra-classroom expedition to the school nurse or school secretary. They are very much a part of the total school membership and I would wish that there were some of them in our kindergartens that we might work with them for a full nine years.

Epitomizing their involvement with their classmates is the report of a parent of one of our neighborhood first graders. This mother in a teacher conference reported that every evening she had heard reports about Mary - one of her youngster's classmates. When she had questioned her child about Mary's identity the child replied, "Mummy, we have two Davids, and two Marys, in my room, and I can't tell which is who." The Mary in question was a little METCO girl, the only one in the class.

Sincerely,

/s/Virginia M. Thompson
Principal
(Michael Driscoll School - Brookline)

METCO Community Committees were formed in each city or town at the outset of the program. Their untiring efforts in establishing METCO in their communities; helping to select, or actually selecting, host families; providing logistic support when buses are missed or special trips to or from Boston are required; and coordinating social gatherings make them the unsung heroes of the program.

The Public Media have been drawn to the METCO program because of the human interest and innovative factors that they find. The position that METCO directors took at the outset was that every effort should be expended to make the program as natural as possible for the 220 students. Selfishly, it would have been our desire that this be accomplished with no public notice. This was unreal since METCO is news; secondly, it is a pilot program which entails an obligation to inform others of its nature and progress.

We have been blessed with complete cooperation on the part of the scores of writers and producers with whom we have had contact. The men and women representing local suburban weeklys, city and national dailys, national weeklys, national monthlys, wire services, professional journals, local radio and television, and national television have all respected the sensitive nature of the program. The fact that a single staff was available to coordinate the coverage has made possible the prevention of overexposure of any particular group of students.

In addition to the program's coverage, it has enjoyed considerable editorial support and some examples are quoted - When other topics were in an editorial only the parts relating to METCO are included but in no case is the intent of the editorial distorted.

RADIO AND TELEVISION EDITORIALS

WEEI - May 18, 1966

> "The Wellesley School Committee has shown both courage and good judgment by its recent decision to participate in the METCO Program. Under this program, some thirty Negro students from Boston will be bused to Wellesley to attend classes there and be given the opportunity to learn in one of the finest school systems in the state.
>
> The Wellesley School Committee was under great pressure to reverse an earlier decision to participate in the project. A small number of private citizens, giving as their reasons for opposition everything but simple prejudice, objected to the Committee's decision.
>
> A poll of some 1,250 of Wellesley's 14,000 registered voters indicated that more than 80 per cent opposed participation in METCO, while another 80 per cent favored a referendum vote to determine whether the community should or should not participate.

The School Committee wisely ignored the poll and decided instead to exercise the authority given it under the town charter.

The charter places the responsibility for running the schools in the hands of the School Committee. The people of Wellesley obviously thought enough of their present School Committee members to place them in office in the last election. If sufficiently displeased with their actions, they can always vote them out in the next. Meanwhile, the School Committee should determine those educational policies which are, in its collective judgment, best for Wellesley.

METCO is far from a perfect program, but at least it helps cope with the problem of segregated education. Several Bay State communities, all of which have excellent school systems, have already agreed to share the benefits of these systems with students from Boston. They have also realized that participation is valuable both to the students from Boston and to their own students as well.

If education is to be a total learning experience, it must include contact with those of different backgrounds, races and religions. The Wellesley School Committee has taken a step toward providing this experience for its own students as well as educationally-deprived students from Boston, and WEEI commends it for its action."

WEEI - September 10, 1966 - This editorial reviewed the record of the 1966 legislative session and included in its comments:

"The 1966 General Court can also point with pride to its efforts to improve education. It provided the funds for educational expansion by passing a new tax program, and it endorsed the METCO Program to enable children from Boston to take advantage of the educational opportunities offered in suburban communities."

WBZ - May 18 and 19, 1966

"Our editorial hat is off today to the Wellesley School Committee. Its members voted unanimously Monday night to move ahead with participation in the so-called METCO plan to take a limited number of Negro youngsters into suburban classrooms in the Fall.

The vote came in the face of strong opposition in a public opinion poll on Saturday. It's our hope that the voting was not an accurate reflection of public sentiment on the issue in the town. Only about 10% of Wellesley's voters took part. And we suspect that those who made a point of balloting were largely those with strong anti feelings. Those who are willing to accept social responsibility, educational innovation and the realities of the 20th century probably went about their Saturday chores as usual.

But even if the sentiment of the townspeople is opposed, we feel the School Committee is on solid ground in moving ahead. Racial barriers have to be broken down, for the good of whites as well as Negroes. There has to be more metropolitan thinking and action of the type that METCO represents. There's a natural resistance to change, especially when it involves something or someone very new and strange. But sometimes the only way to prove that progress is possible is to force it. The decision may be unpopular at first. But in time it will be accepted, even applauded.

The METCO plan is being carefully worked out by competent educators. It's not intended as a full answer to the racial imbalance in Boston's schools. But it's a step in the right direction for the entire metropolitan area. And again WBZ gives its full support to all those people who are working to make it a reality."

WBZ - September 10, 11, and 12, 1966

"Boston's schools have reopened for another year. Boston shares a broad range of educational problems with other cities and towns across the state. But there are special difficulties here for the city's 23,000 Negro children. And very little is being done to help them by the Boston School Committee."

"In all the talk about bussing, though, it should be remembered that both METCO and Exodus combined affect only about 5% of the Negro school children. And the basic problems of Boston schools go far beyond the racial issue. They involve the conditions in buildings and the educational programs for children throughout the city. The future of Boston depends in large part on how well and how quickly these problems are solved."

BOSTON GLOBE - October 7, 1966 - In an editorial on the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights hearings ended with:

"Perhaps the Federal commission's staff, in drawing up its report next year, will note that Boston's Exodus and METCO busing programs are tiny, flickering candles bravely lighting the darkness; and that their example should pave the way for greater Federal grants for much larger busing projects."

67

BOSTON GLOBE - November 6, 1966 - In an editorial urging aid for Exodus:

> "If the public schools serving Boston's Negro community were in decent physical shape and had the needed teaching and programs, there would presumably be less insistence by parents on busing hundreds of children to outside schools.
>
> These are only stopgap measures, but programs like METCO, which buses some to the suburbs, and Operation Exodus, which takes 876 to other city districts, have an added point--which Sen. Edward M. Kennedy recognizes. He said recently the projects are "... a powerful force for improvement in the Negro community, bringing to its members a heightened sense of dignity and self-respect."

BOSTON GLOBE - February 21, 1967 - An editorial on U. S. Commission report:

> "And in Massachusetts, it gives massive ammunition to the friends of the state's pioneering racial imbalance law, strengthens the hand of the State Board of Education in trying to end imbalance in the Boston schools, and encourages the supporters of METCO, Exodus and other programs aimed at improving the lot of ghetto children by putting them into good schools outside the ghetto."

BOSTON HERALD - September 9, 1966

> "The school year started in Greater Boston yesterday and the most interesting thing about it was the METCO (for Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunities), program. Two hundred and twenty Negro children from Boston are being bused daily to schools in seven suburban communities so that they can get the sort of education that is unavailable to them in their own neighborhoods.
>
> METCO is financed by a Federal grant, and it is a good thing for those children who can take advantage of it. It is a good thing also for the children who live in the suburbs who, for the most part, will be going to school with Negro children for the first time in their lives.
>
> But the fact that there is a need for METCO should make every citizen of Boston ashamed. It is a fine, idealistic project but it came into existence because we have de facto segregation in Boston's schools and because de facto segregation in Boston's schools and because de facto segregation inevitably means that the children in the all-Negro schools are given second-class educations. It is shameful, too, that the Negro community has had to resort to Operation Exodus--and pay for it out of its own pocket--so that they can move Negro children from second-rate schools to better schools within the city. It is absurd, of course, that Exodus, which has proved itself for more than a year, should not get Federal funds if METCO can get them without any trial period.

But METCO and Exodus, except for the small minority which participates in the two programs, do little to solve Boston's major educational problems. It is even possible, especially if the programs expand, that they might hold back solutions of the big problems because some people might exaggerate their importance and think that the programs actually were doing the whole job.

The token effect, however, could be important if, on the other hand, it eventually aroused the conscience of Boston so that there was a strong, popular demand for good schools and up-to-date school policies. And METCO could be important in a major way if it eventually could lead to a metropolitan solution to the school problem.

It has been said in some suburban communities that putting our public school systems on a metropolitan basis might be fine for Boston but would be nothing but an educational and financial drag on the suburbs. But it is possible that the visited children may get more out of METCO than the visitors. And putting Greater Boston's school systems on a metropolitan basis could mean advantages for the suburban communities as well in terms of equipment and facilities shared and the capability of hiring specialists in various fields who could serve several communities or even the whole huge system at once.

Such solutions should be thought about now, but the immediate problem is still Boston. When is the city ever going to pull itself together and do something? What we need is an educational urban renewal program. Everybody knows this but we don't seem to be getting much closer to having it."

WORCESTER TELEGRAM - August 4, 1966

"By committing public funds to the METCO plan to bus Boston Negro children to suburban schools, the Massachusetts Legislature has taken a large step toward giving the Negro the educational tools to make his way in American society.

Admittedly, the METCO program is small. It involves only a few hundred pupils and few suburban towns. But it is a start, and as a pioneering effort, it should be extremely valuable.

The legislators may not have realized, though, in passing on the inter-community busing principle, that they were also committing themselves to a much broader concept, beyond the issues of Negro integration.

One of the Negro's great needs is economic opportunity, and one of the basic problems of the modern city is much the same. The pattern has been the same all over the nation. The middle class has fled the city from which it draws its sustenance, and has instead put its taxes to work in the suburbs, creating, in a sense, a separate social order.

And the poor, both white and Negro, are often left behind to struggle and slug it out, with and against each other, in a decaying urban environment.

The suburbs and the people who live in them around Boston do have a certain moral obligation to Boston and its problems; and the seven towns who are taking on METCO students - Arlington, Braintree, Brookline, Lexington, Lincoln, Newton and Wellesley - are recognizing that. Without a Boston, there would be no Arlington, or any of the others.

The suburbs have their own problems, and their own expenses. The legislature's action, in funding the METCO program, gives these communities the chance to meet their responsibilities and to further the cause of sensible regionalism.

The good wishes - and some fears, too - of many ride with the METCO experiment. It will be interesting to watch."

ALLSTON-BRIGHTON CITIZEN ITEM (a Boston Weekly) - May 26, 1966 - "A Summer Potpourri" editorial included:

"It is disturbing to us to find so many people on both sides trying to second-guess the METCO plan to bus Negro youngsters to the suburbs. The time for Monday morning quarterbacking is after the game. Let's wait until the program has been operative for a year or two before we make any judgments.

For the time being, it will suffice to say that METCO offers only a temporary answer to a problem which will be with Boston and other urban centers for a long while.

Although the plan to send Negro children to classrooms in a number of suburban communities will only involve 200 pupils at first, it must be remembered, first that the number will grow if the program is a success and second, that the plan is a stop-gap action which should be replaced by meaningful planning on the part of the Boston School Committee.

From the dissidents of both extremes - the hard-nosed opponents of METCO like those who popped up in Wellesley a few weeks ago and the Negro parents who say METCO is much too weak a remedy - we ask patience and understanding."

School Committee Members in two towns considering METCO are recorded in the press as having changed their position. First, from the WAYLAND-WESTON TOWN CRIER of February 2, 1967,

> "While __________ argued last spring that METCO seemed impractical on a basis of the inconvenience of Boston students from many standpoints, including transportation, Monday night he expressed the thought that METCO has 'worked so well' in other communities, it could work equally as well in Wayland."

The second is found in the QUINCY PATRIOT LEDGER (West Edition) of March 1, 1967- Where in a description of a favorable METCO vote by the Westwood School Committee it states,

> "Another committee member in favor of entering the controversial program is ______________, who told those present that 18 months ago he would have voted against the town's taking part. He said, 'I am grateful that we took no precipitous action but moved in the direction of obtaining greater understanding before voting on Westwood's participation.'
>
> He said, 'Aren't we in Westwood and other similar communities superior beings to those, 'black or white' who have not exhibited the capabilities of bettering themselves such as we have done in Westwood? Aren't we and citizens of all like towns the 'super beings' of the Greater Boston Community? Do we want our children's education to be slowed down to that of the average of Boston?'
>
> 'Such thinking,' ______________ admitted, 'which was mine at that time can be summed up in one word - prejudice.'"

An unsolicited letter from the Lincoln School Committee dated November 5, 1966 reads as follows:

> "Encouraging reports at this early date on the METCO program here in Lincoln indicate that this experiment is proving beneficial to all concerned.
>
> Of course, we are pleased to have the ten METCO children in our kindergarten group, and we hope that you will be able to obtain funds to carry on an extended program next year. While it is too soon to assess results, we do feel that METCO deserves a fuller trial and should be continued. All indications suggest that the most effective point of entry is on the kindergarten level, and we hope that the program will provide future support for more kindergarten aged children."

Chairman Lincoln School Committee

Opposition to METCO was either sporadic or non-existent in the several participating communities with the exception of Wellesley where an organized "Operation Challenge METCO" developed.

This small, but vocal, group objected to the action of the school committee without a sampling of the community's attitude via a referendum or town meeting vote (local school committees in Massachusetts have considerable autonomy and no other school policy has been resolved via referendum).

There was also objection to the use of Federal funds and a fear that local autonomy would eventually be usurped by a metropolitan school district.

An unofficial referendum sponsored by the opponents favored their position and the controversy continued.

A feature article in the June 19, 1966 Boston Sunday Herald described the reaction of the school committee.

> "'I believe they thought they'd scare us out of it,' says Sargent. (Mr. David Sargent of the school committee and a member of the METCO Executive Committee.) They thought we'd reverse ourselves.
>
> 'One fellow, a man I've known very well got up and talked about impeaching us - the members of the school committee.'"

The positive posture represented by the preceding quote resulted in a reaffirmation of the intent of the school committee to participate and the arrival of summer brought an end to the verbal resistance. The students were welcomed in September.

A particularly noteworthy aspect was the support of the student council of Wellesley High School. Two representatives later brought credit to themselves, their school, and their community as they described their role in METCO in testimony before the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights.

The Wellesley opposition did nothing to embarrass the children or the program as the year progressed. They did present a candidate in March 1967 for the school committee, where two vacancies existed, but were unsuccessful in their bid.

It is particularly significant that this candidate no longer opposed METCO in toto. His platform included continuance of the present students, but opposition to any expansion - a testimonial to the Wellesley METCO students.

METCO became an issue in the Brookline School Committee election where Leon Trilling, the President of METCO and a member of the committee was challenged by a candidate who openly opposed METCO. Professor Trilling's success was one more indication of METCO's acceptance and support by the citizens of the participating communities.

III

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

An integral part of the program is the "grass roots" participation of citizens in both Rox bury and the suburbs.

Roxbury Community Committees consisting of all the parents of students attending school in each of the seven suburbs have been formed. Originally it was necessary for these groups to meet before the program started in September to obtain information about their new schools, bus pick up locations, etc. The need to continue meeting was apparent to all at the first meeting since car pools for P.T.A. meetings or other trips to the suburban school would be necessary, and there was a desire on the part of all to know each other better.

As time went on, each of the groups decided to entertain their host families in Roxbury in order that they might strengthen the developing friendships and at the same time reciprocate for the kindness the host families had demonstrated by being a suburban source of contact for their children. Five committees have prepared buffet suppers or other social activities already and others are being planned. All have been very well attended and extremely enjoyable evenings have resulted.

A Roxbury Community Council consisting of representatives from the several Roxbury Community Committees has been formed with the idea that it could be a vehicle for greater community communication among the several groups and at the same time be a source of counsel to the METCO staff. in the latter capacity, the council has been asked to review copies of multi-racial texts and provide opinions concerning the suitability of these texts for their children. The staff, in turn, will be able to transmit this information to the several school systems.

The council conducted a METCO program for all parents on a recent Sunday afternoon and utilized two METCO parents with particular talents as speakers. Discussion groups followed the speakers and the desire of all to have more of the seminar-type programs attests to its success.

The council has also discussed the possibility of providing a speaker's bureau which would have Negro speakers available for school assemblies or classroom presentations.

The members of the council and the community committees also have the potential for being resource people in their own neighborhoods where they will be able to provide information about some of the educaitonal experiences of their children to non-METCO parents and thereby stimulate interest in improvement of the Boston school system.

The council also provides a member for the METCO long-range planning committee, personnel committee, and executive committee.

Suburban Community Committees were described in an earlier chapter. These too are "grass root" groups who have stimulated suburban interest in the program and have coordinated the METCO activities in the several towns.

These groups send representative members to meetings to share and compare information about the program. Undoubtedly, they will be conducting joint meetings with the Roxbury community council as common objectives develop.

IV

CHRONOLOGY OF DEVELOPMENT

When a program such as METCO develops it is not always easy to determine the actual sequence of events preceding it. Mrs. Warren M. Haussler, METCO Secretary prepared this chronology in outline form and further information about any particular item may be obtained by writing to the METCO office.

For more than three years the attention of the suburbs has been increasingly drawn to the problems confronting Boston's Negro school-children. This concern has led to a number of joint programs between Roxbury and suburban groups. This timetable outlines the sequence of events leading up to the fall of 1965, and describes the subsequent formation of METCO.

A. June 1963 - NAACP presented list of 14 demands to Boston School Committee, which refused to admit existence of de facto segregation in Boston schools.

B. February 1964 - Boston School Stayout, organized by Mass. Freedom Movement in cooperation with urban and suburban rights groups. Suburban children and parents attended the day-long Freedom Schools established to protest Boston school conditions. This marked the first large-scale involvement of suburbs in Boston school problems.

C, June 1964 - Boardman Parents organize to protest transfer of Negro children to school in BRA redevelopment zone. An injunction was sought, and denied. After a hearing Sept, 14, the parents then launched their own busing program to the Peter Faneuil School in Back Bay. This was the forerunner of Operation Exodus.

D. Sept. - Nov. 1964 - Brookline Civil Rights Committee asked Brookline School Committee to accept Boston Negro children, A citizen-staff committee was appointed to study the question, The committee included Leon Trilling, Brookline School Committee, Robert H, Sperber, Superintendent of Schools, high school students and others. They met with Mrs. Ruth M, Batson, of the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination (now Associate Director of METCO) and Paul Parks, Education Officer of NAACP, to consider Brookline's helping with the impasse existing in Boston - The question of accepting children in Brookline was never resolved but a tutorial program resulted.

E. April 1965 - Publication of the Kiernan Commission Report, followed by a renewed drive by NAACP and other groups to convince the Boston School Committee to alleviate the problem of imbalance, and improve the quality of education in Roxbury schools.

F. May-August 1965 - Plans formulated by NAACP and Mass. Federation for Fair Housing & Equal Rights (umbrella group over suburban rights committees) to support a state-drafted bill calling for an end to racial imbalance. Suburban groups (Federation member committees) joined with urban groups to achieve passage of the Racial Imbalance Act, which was signed on August 18,

G. Cooperative summer programs in more than 20 communities brought suburban and Boston Negro children together. Similar programs were held in the summer of 1966, many of them of a community-wide nature.

H. September 1965 - Operation Exodus began, under the direction of Mrs. Ellen Jackson, and Mrs. Elizabeth G. Johnson, METCO Staff Assistant. More than 400 children were bused to available seats in Boston schools outside Roxbury under Boston's open enrollment policy. Year-long fund raising drives to cover transportation costs led to further interest and involvement of suburban communities.

I. October 1965 - To begin implementation of the Racial Imbalance Act (Chap. 641) provision calling for "voluntary cooperation between cities and towns to relieve imbalance, the Federation announced a meeting for November 4, to explore the extent of interest for a plan of educational cooperation between suburban school systems and Boston. Member committees were asked to invite their local school representatives.

J. November 2 - Boston School Committee elections. Mrs. Ruth M. Batson led voter drive in Ward 12, Roxbury, and achieved an almost total turnout. (Negro community vote was approximately 70%, as contrasted with approximately 35% in white sections.) The Federation coordinated a suburban work force of 250 which helped transport Roxbury voters to the polls.

K. November 4 - MFFHER (Federation) Council Meeting. School committee members and superintendents from over a dozen towns heard Deputy Commissioner of Education Dr. Thomas J. Curtin, and Professor Leon Trilling of the Brookline School Committee, urge suburban communities to join in a plan similar to the one proposed to Brookline earlier in the year. The proposal was received with interest, but no committments were requested at this time.-

L. November 10 - Sudbury Human Rights Council & Sudbury League of Women Voters sponsored a meeting at which Paul Parks (Federation Board; NAACP), Edward J. Logue (Boston Redevelopment Authority) and Thomas S. Eisenstadt (Boston School Committee) debated Boston school problems. More than 500 attended; audience interest and concern were such that Federation Board members (7), attending were convinced the time was appropriate for action.

M. November - (1) Preliminary contacts were made the following day by Federation Board members Mrs. John A. Keil and Mrs. Warren M. Haussler, who called Federation member committees to ascertain their interest. As soon as it was determined that a number of communities were prepared to offer strong support to their school committees, Prof. Trilling was contacted. His response was positive, and a meeting was arranged.

(2) On November 15, Mrs. Keil, Mrs. Haussler, Mrs. Henry H. Cutler of Wellesley and Mrs. Jerome B. Wiesner, then state chairman for Human Resources of the League of Women Voters, met with Prof. Trilling at his M.I.T. office. An ad hoc resource group was formed, and a small meeting was scheduled for December 14, to involve those school representatives who responded favorably to Prof. Trilling's exploratory calls. Meanwhile, news of the proposed program spread

rapidly, and by the end of November some fifteen communities had expressed interest in learning more about the program.

(3) Prof. Trilling made professional contacts for the December 14 meeting. Mr. Paul Parks contacted Roxbury leaders, including Mr then MCAD Commissioner, and Mrs. Ellen Jackson, who suggested Operation Exodus' co-chairman, Mrs. Elizabeth G. Johnson as a representative of that program.

N. December 2 - Mr. Parks arranged a meeting at the State Department of Education to discuss legal aspects. Deputy Commissioner Thomas J. Curtin, Assistant Director of Elementary & Secondary Education Joseph E. Killory, and SDE Counsel Wallace met with nine members of the group. Dr. Curtin indicated strong interest in the "pursuit of open enrollment in any and all forms," and emphasized that any plan must; (a) satisfy the Racial Imbalance Act and (b) result in a meaningful plan in terms of quality integrated education. He requested a written outline of the group's plan, which was prepared and sent.

O. December 3 - A bill enabling children to attend schools in cities and towns other than that in which they reside was filed on behalf of the Federation by State Senate Majority Leader Kevin F. Harrington. The bill (S.110, passed as H.3905) was an extension of the intent of the Racial Imbalance Act.

P. December 11 - Mrs. Wiesner participated in a Harvard panel on education, and outlined a general plan for a "metropolitan council on education." Dr. Curtin, Mr. Killory, Mr. Parks, Mrs. Batson, Mrs. Wiesner and Mrs. Haussler met at a luncheon with Dr. Herman Goldberg, Rochester Superintendent of Schools, who had pioneered a small-scale program involving one suburban community.

Q. December 14 - Exploratory meeting, held in Brookline, Prof. Trilling presentation was well-received by 65 school representatives and citizens. The school systems of Newton, Wellesley, Lexington, Bedford, Winchester, Wayland, Arlington, Sudbury and Brookline all designated personnel to follow up the meeting. The State Department of Education and Mass. Council for Public Schools, and observers from Lincoln, Needham, Watertown and Weston also participated. Plans were then made to implement the program; committees were set up to work on funding, program planning, long-range goals, and community coordination. By the end of December the basic METCO program was defined, and the name of the organization chosen.

R. January 1966 - Dr. Charles E. Brown, Newton Superintendent of Schools, agreed to draft a proposal to be submitted to the U. S. Office of Education under Title III of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act. School committees in Brookline, Lexington, Newton and Wellesley voted to participate.

February 9 - Federal proposal submitted.
February 14 - Proposal to Carnegie Corporation of New York, requesting funding for staff and office, was submitted under the auspices of the Council for Public Schools.
February 16 - Braintree School Committee voted to join; Arlington voted on April 11. A revised proposal was submitted to include these two communities.

May 10 - Lincoln and Concord voted to participate. Funding for Concord could not be obtained at that late date, but funds to allow ten kindergarten children to attend Lincoln schools were obtained from a variety of private sources. Winchester and Sharon voted to participate when seats became available.

S. March 7 - State House hearing on S. 110. Professional educators and expert laymen testified on behalf of the bill.

T. March-August - Community Coordinator Mrs. John A. Keil established Community Committees in participating towns. These were to be broad based committees, drawing representatives from better-school groups, PTAs, ministerial alliances, Federation member committees, LWV, and including school officials and community leaders. Prime role of these committees was to generate community interest and support in the program, help select host families for the METCO children, and to maintain liason between parents, schools and the METCO staff.

Mrs. Hubert E. Jones, Newton coordinator, drew up a set of Guide lines for participating systems, and developed orientation materials and programs for participating school personnel.

U. March 24 - METCO Incorporation meeting. By-laws were prepared and a slate of Officers, Executive Committee and Board of Directors was drawn up, and standing committees formed. Application papers were filed with the Commonwealth.

V. March 21 - Boston School Committee voted 3-2 to endorse METCO.

W. April 27 - METCO Officers and participating superintendents met at State Department of Education offices with HEW Title III representatives. Preliminary approval of the proposal was given at this time.

X. May 24 - METCO Board of Directors appointed to the staff: Mr. Joseph E. Killory, Executive Director; Mrs. Ruth M. Batson, Associate Director; Mrs. Elizabeth G. Johnson, Office Manager.

Y. June-August - Final funding approval was received early in June, and METCO offices opened at 178 Humboldt Avenue, Roxbury. During the summer months the staff interviewed and selected children, assigned them to participating systems, and arranged for transportation contracts.

Mr. David K. Archibald was appointed director of research and evaluation.

Z. February-August - Legislative efforts on behalf of S. 110 (dubbed the "METCO bill" by the press) continued. METCO participating systems, Federation Board member committees, and the League of Women Voters, which officially endorsed the program, worked to achieve passage. The bill was signed into law on August 13.

V

HOST FAMILIES

It was clear at the outset of the program that much of the parental worry about the children being in school some distance away could be alleviated by having a suburban home available in the event of sickness or other emergency. This was the basis for the development of the host family in the suburbs and it has served this role admirably.

In addition, it has provided a great deal of positive interaction between the two families and between the two communities (suburban and urban). Host families have provided social events for the students, invited the students to remain over night when there were evening programs (plays, sports, etc.), and have also provided late transportation when needed.

Some of the children of the host families have been guests of their urban friends for special weekend trips to events in Boston and there have been community events for all in both suburb and city (cookouts and buffet suppers mentioned previously). New friendships between the adults have developed as well as between the students.

The host families were sought in different ways by different communities and on the basis of the first year's experience it would appear that primary responsibility for the host family program should rest with the suburban METCO committee which would work cooperatively with the school authorities. Assignment of the task of recruiting and selecting host families to the individual principals without the help of the local committed does not appear to be as practical since much of the coordination and in-service work must take place during the summer when schools are closed.

The schools can cooperate by sending requests for volunteers home in the spring to all parents whose children will be in classes with METCO children. While it is not absolutely essential that the host family have a child in the same class (homeroom in secondary schools), it appears to be more desirable. The screening and final selection should be a joint effort of both school personnel and community committees "Screening" in this case does not imply value judgment but means seeking families where the METCO child and the suburban child have common interests. Obviously, perfect matching is not going to be possible in all cases.

It should be noted that in some cases there has been little contact between children and host families and still an excellent degree of adjustment to and happiness with school exists.

In those systems where children go home at noon, the host family shares lunch with the METCO child and this has proved to be a rewarding experience for all.

Some of the typical reactions of host families to a questionnaire are included at this point to give the reader an indication of the satisfactions that this part of the program has provided.

1. "We hope that if these children continue in Arlington schools we will be able to have __________ in our home as long as she is in Arlington."

2. "I know that __________'s easy friendship with __________ will have a lasting, lifetime effect on his relations with other people wherever he may go. I only hope that ________ gained half as much from the experience as our son did."

3. "Having the METCO child come here has helped my children to understand some of the problems others face. We have discussions about this as well as general ones on brotherhood, etc."

4. "The rapport between the parents of the METCO children and their host families seems very good. The two dinners - one in Wellesley, one in Roxbury - certainly were successful as social events with both parents and children involved. To our knowledge, the rapport between the children in school, for the most part, has been especially good for the Wellesley children. It is hard to judge from our vantage point, what effect it is having on the METCO children."

5. "My youngest child (who was directly involved was previously inclined to be overly solicitous toward Negroes - she now seems to be able to evaluate individual Negroes on the same basis as she would ordinarily accept or reject people - by personality rather than being influenced by sympathy."

6. "We have been most blessed in having this boy added to our family if only part time. His relationships with other boys, as well as the postman, baker, etc., is that of any of my sons. He plays well and is sought by the boys to be included in their play during lunch hours. He is a very social being and is usually late for lunch as he has such a good time on the way home."

It is quite apparent that mutual respect and appreciation exists between host families and Roxbury families. Each is extending effort which enables the children of both to obtain a quality, integrated education.

VI

EVALUATION

At the outset it should be made clear that METCO, funded under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, was not intended to be organized around a research design. Title III provides for innovative and for exemplary programs; the evaluation is expected to provide analysis of information about the program for the use of this and similar programs. A "tight" research design, with control and experimental groups, was not anticipated.

The following description of the evaluation was prepared by Dr. David K. Archibald, Director of Research and Evaluation:

I. Introduction

METCO is a complex program and has many goals. Consequently, there are several possible foci for evaluation. The most obvious, of course, is the effect of the program on those persons most directly concerned--the students who bus each day from Boston to 28 schools in the seven suburban towns. Other areas are also important, such as the effect of the program on the predominantly white student bodies in the receiving schools; the effects on school curricula and policies; community reaction to the program, both in Boston and in the suburbs; the role and development of the host family and local committee organizations; and the change in communication among civic organizations within the whole metropolitan area.

Clearly, not all of these situations could be investigated in depth during the first year of the program. Other agencies than the METCO Evaluation Staff may be in better positions to deal with certain questions, as well. The highest priority seemed necessarily to be a thorough study of what effects the program had on the METCO students themselves and on their families. Beyond that, some study of the schools and the host families seemed indicated. Any detailed analysis of the effects on students and parents in the receiving towns would be premature before the second year of operation.

II. The Criterion Variables

The following areas were felt to be crucial in determining the effectiveness of the program in terms of the goals set by the METCO Board of Directors.

A. Academic Achievement. Although major changes in achievement level would not ordinarily be expected in one year, they may occur dramatically in a period of two or more. Baseline data from standard achievement tests has been collected. Testing is being repeated in the Spring of 1967; to determine any changes in the first year. Evaluation in subsequent years will be able to use this data for a baseline.

Records are being kept routinely of academic grades given in each marking period, and unusual changes from previous performance noted.

B. Vocational and Educational Aspirations. Interviews conducted early and late in the school year will give information concerning any changes in the nature and specificity of vocational and educational plans of the students. It is anticipated that although the first year may show little change, subsequent years may result in considerable change, especially along the dimension of detail of planning.

C. Social Adjustment. Social adjustment in the schools is clearly of great importance. This problem is faced by any newcoming students, but for the METCO students this situation is made far more complex in that they are Negroes from a city going to virtually all-white suburban schools. Furthermore, they are in the communities for only a few hours each day, arriving and leaving (somewhat conspicuously) on special busses.

Social adjustment will be measured through self-report statements in the interviews; by observation of the teachers; through the friendship choices of their classmates in sociometric questionnaires; and by indirect report from interviews with their parents. Change across the year will be measured in second sociometric testing and the second interview with the students.

D. METCO Student Attitudes. Changes in attitude across the year, to be ascertained through two interviews with the METCO students, will be determined on the following dimensions; as they relate to:

1. The program as a whole, including recommendation for change;

2. The busing operation;

3. Their schools and teachers, especially in comparison with last year's schools and teachers;

4. The students in the receiving schools;

5. Their host families.

III. Independent Variables

The criterion variables described above will be analyzed for relationships with school, town, grade level and sex of the students, as well as prior anxiety, extent of prior experience in racially unbalanced schools, prior attitudes toward schools, attitudes of their teachers, and their host family relationships.

IV. The collection of data began in September, has continued through the year and will be completed sometime in early June. Analysis of the data has been continuing since December and will be completed in early July. Preliminary and intermediate reports are being written periodically, and the final evaluation report will be completed in early August.

V. Attached is a report to METCO officials entitled Academic Ability and Achievement of METCO Students as of October, 1966.

MEMORANDUM

ACADEMIC ABILITY AND ACHIEVEMENT OF METCO STUDENTS

AS OF OCTOBER, 1966.

TO: METCO Officers and Executive Committee

FROM: Evaluation Staff

March 21, 1967

I. Academic Ability.

Basic academic ability is ordinarily measured by so-called intelligence tests, such as the Stanford-Binet, the Otis, the Kuhlmann Anderson, and the like. Most educators and psychologists are agreed that such tests are by no means a complete indication of a person's intelligence; indeed, there is a considerable disagreement on what "intelligence" consists of. The most commonly used tests tend to measure two general abilities: the understanding and use of language (English) and the analysis and computation of numerical problems. The 150 METCO students for whom intelligence scores are available took tests of this sort.

The average score nationally for any IQ test is 100. Theoretically, the ranges can extend upward of 175 and lower than 40; but 95% of the population would ordinarily fall within the range (approximately) 75-125.

The average score for the METCO students is 102, just slightly higher than the national norm. The range is from 77 to 130, with 68% falling between 90 and 110. This distribution of scores represents a group which does not differ significantly from any group of students drawn randomly from students in the nation at large. Consequently, the numerical and verbal abilities of this group can be considered corresponding to that of the national population. On the other hand, they do fall below the average of suburban students.

II. Academic Achievement Prior to METCO.

Tests measuring academic achievement in particular subject areas were given to most of the students at the beginning of the school year by the various schools they were attending. These achievement tests measure what the student has learned (as opposed to his capacity for learning, which is a rough definition of intelligence). Achievement test scores are generally accepted as highly related to the kind and quality of scholastic training made available to the student. Intelligence scores are much less dependent on training.

In considering METCO achievement scores, one must remember that they reflect education given prior to entrance into METCO. In the overwhelming number of cases, this means education in Boston schools.

It is convenient to deal with the students in two groups, elementary and secondary. We will deal here only with reading and arithmetic achievement. Ordinarily, when dealing with a sample of students with average intelligence, we would expect approximately 50% to be performing below grade level, and

50%, above, according to national standards. In the METCO elementary group, 70% are below their grade level in reading, 32% more than one year behind. In arithmetic computations, 81% are below grade level (but only 19% more than one year behind). In arithmetic problem-solving (which emphasizes analysis and concepts) 67% are performing below grade-level and 39% of these are more than one year behind. The standards used are national norms, it should be remembered; compared with the students in the suburban schools they are now attending, the METCO students entered at an even greater disadvantage.

On the other side of the ledger, looking at students performing more than a year in advance of their grade level, the figures are equally bleak. In ing, only 14% are more than one grade ahead; in arithmetic, an average of 2% are more than one grade ahead.

	More than one grade above	Below grade	More than one grade below
Reading	14%	70%	32%
Arith. Comp.	1.5%	81%	*19%
Arith. Prob.	3.0%	67%	39%

*This figure is only slightly lower than would be expected in the national population.

At the high-school level, no achievement scores in arithmetic were available.

For reading achievement at the high school level, the picture is somewhat better than at the elementary level. Where nationally 50% of the students would be reading below the average, 56% of the METCO students are below average. This figure is misleading, however, because a disproportionate number are reading at a very low level. Thus, 40% of the METCO students have scores lower than 70% of the population at large, which is greater by 10% than it ought to be. On the other hand, the range of reading abilities extends from among the highest nationally, to the lowest. In other words, the high-school students' reading achievement is more in line with their reading abilities.

III. Conclusion.

From the above data, a fairly clear academic picutre of the METCO students emerges. In terms of native ability, they represent the national level both in range and average of intelligence test scores. On the basis of their ability, therefore, they should be equally representative of a national average in achievement tests. This is clearly not the case; in reading and arithmetic skills, they are substantially below the national averages. It is reasonable to conclude, then, that their training in the past has not been geared to either match or challenge their potential learning ability.

In September 1967, a "Report on change in Academic Achievement for a Sample of Elementary School Children" was submitted to the U.S. Office of Education. This is a summary of that report.

The Sample

Of the 220 students, 132 were in grades three through eight. Of that number, 66 in three school systems took the Metropolitan Achievement Test as part of their routine school testing.

Of the remaining 66 students in the same grades, 50 were in one school system that administered a different test battery several months along in the school year. For practical reasons it was not possible to have these students tested on either test in the Autumn of 1966. The remaining 16 students were in a fifth system which administered a third achievement battery. Pre and post-test scores were achieved for this sample, but the small sample size militated against including their results with this report.

The students in the sample under discussion here were all Negro students from Boston, virtually all of whom had attended Boston schools the previous year and most of whom had never attended school outside of Boston. They were selected for the program on the basis of the following things:

1. Volunteer applications, made in most instances by the parents;

2. Minimum limits set as policy for tuition students by the participating school system, to wit, no known serious emotional problems and a certificate of promotion from the most recent school attended;

3. Policy of the METCO Board of Directors that the students as a group represent a broad range of academic ability and economic status.

A very few students were accepted who had not been promoted from the previous year; many more had at one or another time in the past failed to be promoted. Thus, the second criterion should not be taken to mean that only very intelligent or heretofore highly motivated students were selected.

The Instruments

Two kinds of measures were used, the achievement tests referred to above and intelligence tests. In the absence of any better indices of basic ability, IQ is used to provide a rough estimate of the relationship between academic performance and academic ability.

The Metropolitan Achievement Test has separate batteries for grades 3-4, 5-6, and 7-9. Five scales common to all three batteries were selected for this analysis: Word Knowledge (Words), Reading (Rdng), Spelling (Spell), Arithmetic Computation (A. Comp) and Arithmetic Problem-Solving and Concepts (A. Prob). The scale names for the verbal skills are straightforward definitions of the concepts being tested. On the arithmetic scales, A. Comp tests the ability to perform fundamental numerical operations at the given grade level. At the primary level this would include addition, subtraction and the like. The upper grades would have these plus decimals, fractions, graph reading and the like. The A. Prob scale in each battery de-emphasizes computational skills and requires instead the application of arithmetic knowledge to situations requiring reasoning and understanding of the uses of numbers.

The norms for the test come from an age-controlled, nationally stratified sample, which includes, among others, northern urban schools and segregated southern schools, both Negro and white. In all 225 school systems and over 500,000 students were involved in the testing sample. The average IQ of those in the norm sample drawn from this was slightly above 100, due to the elimination from the sample of those who were unusually old for their grade (and presumably in the lower IQ ranges). The norm sample might be expected to have a mean IQ very like that of the METCO sample.

The Distribution of IQ Scores indicates a mean of 102 and a range from 76-127 and measures of skew and kurtosis indicate that the distribution does not differ seriously from the shape of the curve of normal distribution. However, the standard deviation of 10.4, when compared with the national norm s.d. of 16, indicates that the scores are more densely grouped around the mean than would be expected. Thus, rather than 68% of the scores falling between 84 and 116 (+ one s.d. around the mean of 100), 86% of the cases lie in this range. The following table presents the frequencies of IQ scores within ten-point intervals.

IQ FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

Below 81	81-90	91-100	101-110	111-120	Above 120
3%	6%	.33%	39%	14%	5%

ACHIEVEMENT TEST INFORMATION

Initial Test Results

All scores for this analysis are indicated in grade equivalent form which means that the students achievement on a test is given the grade level typical of students throughout the nation. For example, a score of 5.2 indicates that this is the score expected of a student in the fifth year, second month of school. The following charts indicates the number of months that the average (mean) score was above or below the national norm.

Scale	Months Above (+) or Below (-) National Norm
Words	-1
Reading	-5
Spelling	0
Arith. Comp.	-5
Arith. Prob.	-6

16

Test Results Six Months Later

Scale	Months Above (+) or Below (-) National Norm	Net Change
Words	+2	+3
Reading	-2	+3
Spelling	+7	+7
Arith. Comp.	-4	+1
Arith. Prob.	-5	+1

A comparison of the two indicates that during the six month interval the students not only advanced the expected six months in reading but gained an additional three months. Stated differently, the reading scores advanced nine months in six months which is a reversal of the previous tendency of falling behind at an estimated rate of one month per year.

It should be emphasized that the ability of the students (as indicated by I.Q.'s) is at the national norm.

The gains in reading, word knowledge, and spelling are considered to be statistically significant while the gains in arithmetic, though encouraging, are not enough to be so classified.

Per Cent Below National Norm

The percentage of students below national norms on the first test and second test in arithmetic and reading are presented in the following talks. Nationally, fifty per cent are below the norm and fifty per cent above.

Initial Test

Scale	Per Cent Below National Norm
Reading	68%
Arith. Comp.	76%
Arith. Prob.	71%

Second Test

Scale	Per Cent Below National Norm	Net Change
Reading	58%	-10%
Arith Comp.	59%	-17%
Arith Prob.	66%	- 5%

Conclusion

It is apparent that a significant degree of progress has taken place during the six month interval between the two tests (Fall 1966 to Spring 1967) in the areas of reading, word knowledge, and spelling. Encouraging, but not significant, progress was present in arithmetic. Other findings about the social adjustment aspects of the program are presently being coded and key punched for future analysis. The high school academic report similar to the elementary one described in this report is nearing completion.

VII

PRESENT AND THE FUTURE

Role of Carnegie Corporation

While the major support of the program has been from the U.S. Office of Education, it is abundantly clear that without the Carnegie Corporation there would have been no METCO. A two year grant of $126,000 has provided support for administration of the program, and has made it the only one to our knowledge under Title III which mixes public and private funds.

The private funding separates the administration of the program from the individual school committees of the participating communities. METCO, lacking direct authority, must therefore seek the voluntary cooperation of all (parents and suburban school systems). The fact that this cooperation has been constantly forthcoming further attests to the success of the program. This separate funding has also provided a considerable degree of necessary flexibility for the administrative staff.

Role of Stern Family Foundation

In the initial year of the program there were not sufficient funds to include the Town of Lincoln and a $3,000 grant from the Stern Family Foundation was obtained. Reduced expenditures for evaluation made it possible to meet the Lincoln cost from the Federal grant and it was not necessary to use these funds. A subsequent request to keep the funds for extra transportation, cultural programs, etc. during this second year was approved.

Role of Newton Public Schools

The School Committee in the City of Newton agreed to submit the original application for Title III funds and they have handled all of the Federal funds which pay transportation, tuition, and evaluation costs. The continuing patience, diligence, and flexibilty of the staff have been such that the program owes no small part of its success to their ability to expedite all fiscal matters.

Role of the Federal Government

The major funding of METCO has been provided by the U.S. Office of Education under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (P.L. 89-10). The first year grant of $269,500 was followed by a second of $395,713. A request for a third year will be submitted and it is anticipated that this will be a routine renewal.

At present it is the policy of the U.S. Office of Education to limit Title III grants to three years and this then poses the question concerning the role of the Federal government after the school year 1968-1969.

The national interest that has accompanied METCO's development and the national potential in other urban areas would seem to justify continuing Federal support for METCO-type programs. The success of the program as widened by the low student dropout rate (less than 1%), the new suburban community interest described in this section, and the academic advancement described in Chapter VI would appear to be enough to justify new legislation allowing METCO and similar programs to be assured of long-range support.

Role of the State

The Massachusetts Department of Education has actively encouraged the concept of METCO and has aided in its implementation (see pages 3, 3A, and 23).

The State Legislative has supported the concept by passing enabling and supporting legislation (Chapter 506 of the Acts of 1966). The legislature appropriated $100,000 for implementation of the Act this year with approximately $80,000 being used to add an additional 100 students. The remaining $20,000 is being held for the possible development of a similar program in Springfield.

If further Federal support is not available, it will be necessary for the State to support the total program after the Title III funds end.

Role of the City of Boston*

The Boston School Committee has voted in favor of the METCO concept and in February, 1967 its chairman sent a form letter to several suburban communities urging them to participate in September. There has been no other support from Boston for the program; in fact, their approving vote states, "Provided that this program shall not require the expenditure of funds by the City of Boston."

The Massachusetts' Racial Imbalance Act requires school system with schools over 50% non-white to eliminate this imbalance and to provide a plan to the State Board of Education showing the steps to be taken. Failure to provide a satisfactory plan results in the withholding of State funds totalling millions. Boston included the number of students participating in METCO as part of their plan.

If METCO attains the size described in a following paragraph, it is clear that considerable savings will result for Boston. If those savings could be passed along to pay most of the tuition cost, the total cost to the State or Federal governments would be reduced considerably. For example, if the tuition cost in suburbia averages $700 per pupil and the saving to Boston is $500, the State or Federal programs would only have to pay the differential of $200 plus the transportation cost of $190 per pupil. This would make a 3,000 pupil program possible for slightly more than a million dollars. A reduction of tuition costs to the actual amount saved by Boston would cut this in half again.

Only an action such as this should justify their inclusion of METCO in a plan for eliminating imbalance.

Suburban Interest

The first chapter of this report indicates that the number of communities has increased from the original seven to sixteen. In addition, nine other communities voted to participate in METCO but there were no funds available. They are:

Cambridge
Hingham
Lincoln-Sudbury
Malden
Natick
Scituate
Wakefield
Wayland
Winchester

---

*It should be noted that the Superintendent of Schools is represented on the METCO Board of Directors.

At present, an additional eight communities have voiced some degree of interest in future participation.

The METCO Board of Directors took the position that there should be no direct soliciting of communities to urge participation. This was predicated on the assumption that as a voluntary, grass roots program it must spring from the community. A statement of Mr. ____________ of the Westwood School Committee in the Westwood Press on March 1, 1967, endorses this approach:

> "When the METCO question came up 12 months ago, I had many reservations about Westwood's entrance into it. If I had had to vote at that time, I believe my vote would have been a negative one. I am grateful that we took no precipitous action at that time but moved in the direction of obtaining greater understanding before voting on Westwood's participation. We have since learned a great deal about the program and have reviewed the actual experience of the towns participating in it.
>
> I have been very impressed with the approach of the executive Director of METCO. Of course his intention was to interest us in the project but it was an approach to clear up misunderstandings rather than selling a program."
>
> NO OUTSIDE PRESSURE
>
> He made no contact with us until he was called by the committee from our town which we authorized to explore METCO. Simply stated, there has been no outside pressure on us to act." The statement goes on to indicate that information was sought from other sources.

It would be our recommendation to those that would seek to initiate a similar program that this approach be used once the program is established.

Maximum Potential

It would appear that there is a potential of close to three thousand students in the immediate future, utilizing available spaces in those communities which are within approximately one hour's commuting time (including pick up) from Boston. Larger numbers could result from long-range planning efforts and/or declining suburban school enrollments.

Tuition Costs

At present the tuition costs vary from $450 to $900 per student and it would be our desire that communities charge a fee that covered actual additional costs rather than the average cost per pupil. Since the acceptance of students is based upon available space, the actual cost is usually very little. However, this decision must be made locally.

Transportation Costs

The cost per pupil during the first year of operation was about $270 per pupil and this figure covered the cost of a late bus three days a week for those participating in after school programs.

This year the cost per pupil for METCO students alone is again $270 per pupil. This is reduced to $235 per pupil when 81 non-public school students are included. These students are in the BRIDGE program and METCO furnishes transportation without charge to those attending the non-public schools in the communities where METCO trips are being made.

Our initial estimate of a per pupil cost of $150 per year, if maximum utilization of bus seats was made is still accurate. However, the trips are of such a length that two elementary students per seat, rather than three, is more desirable and this would cost about $190 per student.

Minimum Number of Students

It is our recommendation that each participating school have eight or more children regardless of the number of stops that could be made within the one hour commuting time, i.e., a community that is as distant as Framingham or Marblehead cannot anticipate a single bus serving more than two or three schools since it takes from five to eight minutes per school when the distance, traffic, disembarking time, etc. are considered; a community that is closer would not face this time limitation, but it will serve the needs of the students better if it thinks in terms of eight or more per school. Newton, for example, has seventy-five students in eight elementary schools while Reading serves eight in one school and Walpole has sixteen in two schools.

Maximum Number of Students

Here the available space in suburban schools provides the limiting factor. If each elementary school had space for four or five students per classroom, it would be excellent, but there is not this kind of space available at present.

In-Service Programs

METCO staff personnel meet with suburban teachers to provide information about the program and students. This almost always opens discussion about the basic concepts involved. It is clear that more will be necessary for some time if teachers are to fully appreciate the student needs, the nature of prejudice, the importance of multi-racial classroom materials, and the role of Negroes in American and World History. A program utilizing trained group leaders will be used to accelerate this vital aspect of the program if funding can be obtained.

Words of Caution

In any discussion of the future of METCO, it must be made clear that the whole concept is predicated on an extra effort being made by the student participants and their parents. Continuation and expansion should be considered ONLY IF IT SERVES THEIR INTERESTS.

It is our sincere hope that conditions within the city will improve to the point that METCO will not be necessary.

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY
(METCO)

178 HUMBOLDT AVENUE DORCHESTER, MASSACHUSETTS
427-1545

REPORT TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS

June 13, 1968

Should get this if possible

My last report to the Board was in September 1967. I will not attempt to give a detailed report of the school year at this time, as we are preparing our second Report to Carnegie which will be quite complete. Copies of the Carnegie Report will be mailed to every board member.

As you know, in September we increased our enrollment of METCO students from 220 to 425 and the number of communities from seven to sixteen. The increased enrollment (with no additional staff) did not allow us to do some of the work with communities and parents groups we would have liked. However, our Parents Councils functioned and individual community meetings of Roxbury and suburban parents were held. We had our usual share of problems, but in most cases they were not insurmountable.

Number of Children who have left or who are Leaving Program

Arlington	- 0	
Braintree	- 1	
Brookline High School	- 4	(1 private school, 1 graduate)
Brookline Elementary	- 1	(moving to Brookline)
Concord	- 0	
Framingham	- 1	
Lexington	- 2	
Lincoln	- 0	
Marblehead	- 1	(moved to Detroit)
Needham	- 1	(moving to Washington)
Newton	- 2	
Reading	- 1	
Sharon	- 1	
Walpole	- 2	(moving)
Wellesley	- 9	(6 graduates, 2 moving)
Weston	- 0	
Westwood	- 0	

Number of students moving	- 7
Number of students graduating	- 7
Number of students dissatisfied with program	- 3
One parent withdrew student because she felt marking system was unfair	- 1
One parent withdrew student because she felt system was "too free"	- 1

What does this mean?

*Number of children withdrawn from program after consultation with METCO staff, school and parents	- 3
**One child withdrawn from program by school without consultation with staff	- 1 ?
Students dropped for persistent truancy (16 years old)	- 2
Student transferring to private school	- 1
Total number of students	- 26

*Recommendations for two of these children were made and are being implemented. The problem of third student just came to light and will be dealt with.

**Decision was later reversed, but parent would not return child to school.

I have purposely not identified the problems described above with communities as I feel that the privacy of students must be protected. However, I feel that the Board should know reasons for dropouts and/or withdrawals.

REPORT OF COMMUNITIES CURRENTLY IN METCO TO BE FUNDED UNDER TITLE III AND REPORT OF TUITION REDUCTIONS

PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	TUITION COST PER PUPIL (1967-1968)	TUITION COST PER PUPIL (1968-1969)
ARLINGTON	16	$ 434.00	(reduced tuition this year) $ 484.00
BRAINTREE	20	601.00	450.00
BROOKLINE HIGH	23	823.00	(waived tuition for 30 new students to be enrolled) 1,012.00 (June 10, 1968 Town vote $550.00 per student)
BROOKLINE ELEMENTARY	52	701.00	742.00
LEXINGTON	25	870.00	415.00
LINCOLN ELEMENTARY	18	313.00	301.00
LINCOLN KINDERGARTEN		450.00	
WELLESLEY	25	900.00	(reduced tuition for students under state funding) 900.00
NEWTON ELEMENTARY •	47	599.67	21.00
NEWTON JR. HIGH	3	849.11	30.00
CONCORD-CARLISLE	20	900.00	450.00
MARBLEHEAD	20	637.00	350.00
SHARON	25	527.80	There will be no reduction -- new per pupil rate not computed at time of this report.
WALPOLE	16	339.52	325.00
WESTON	9	271.12	200.00 (elementary) 100.00 (kindergarten)
WESTWOOD	9	460.00	400.00

The following communities currently in METCO funded only under state funds and tuition reductions

Community	Number of Students	1967-1968 tuition rate per pupil	1968-1969
Framingham	9	$ 459.20	$ 230.00
Needham	9	771.43	tuition waived
Reading	9	378.00	300.00

The following communities currently in METCO were funded under state funds in addition to federal funds (1967-1968)

Community	Number of Students
Brookline	25
Newton	25
Wellesley	25

Communities Currently in METCO - Requesting Additional Students

Community	Participants 1967-1968	Additional Number of Students	Grades	Total Requested 1968-1969
Arlington	15	15	K	30
Braintree	19	1	(replacement)	20
Brookline	98	30	15 (ele.) 15 (high)	128
Lexington	25	65	2, 3, 4	90
Lincoln	18	32	K, 12	50
Wellesley	50	25	Jr. High	75
Newton	75	25	elementary	100
Concord-Carlisle	20	10	High school	30
Marblehead	20	6	Jr. High	26
Sharon	25	13	Jr. High	38
Walpole	16	8	2, 3	24
Weston	9	9	K	18
Westwood	9	16	elementary	25
Framingham	9	41	elementary	50
Needham	9	11	High school	20
Reading	8	1	(replacement)	9
	425	308		733

The State Department of Education has placed the requests from the communities to continue present students and/or add new students CATEGORY I. These requests will be funded pending approval of MET appropriation.

State Department of Education Breakdown Continued

CATEGORY II

New Communities - Springfield Area - Elementary

Town	Grade(s)	Number Requested	Tuition or Other Costs	Transp. Costs	To Re
E. Longmeadow	1-4	20	8,620	6,954	15,
Longmeadow	K-4	31	11,650	9,050	20,
		51	Total requested		$36,

CATEGORY III

New Communities - Boston Area - Elementary

Town	Grade(s)	Number of Students	Tuition Cost Per Pupil
Concord	5, 6	25	330 (reduced from (
Swampscott	1, 2, 3	20	650

CATEGORY IV

New Communities - Boston Area - Junior High and High

Town	Grade(s)	Number of Students	Tuition Cost Per Pupil
Natick	8, 9, 10	24	No tuition
Milton	10	30	120 (reduced)
Hingham	10	20	100 (reduced)

Total number of spaces offered and which can be funded under Federal State Funds - 852

The following requests for funds to State Department of Education have been placed in Category V.

Canton
Cohasset
Dover
Lincoln-Sudbury
Lynnfield
Masconomet
Salem
Scituate
Wakefield
Wayland
Weymouth

LIST

The maximum Amount of Funds Anticipated are as follows -

1.	Currently included in the 1968-1969 budget	247,000.00
2.	Estimated amount remaining from the original 1967-1968 appropriation of 100,000	23,000.00
3.	Additional amount added to 1967-1968 budget	100,000.00
		370,000.00

This amount will continue [illegible] students and honor requests for additional students in Categories I, II, III, and IV.

We are grateful to Joe Killory for the statistics and report from the State Department of Education which enables us to give you this information as it pertains to state funding.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

In Service Program for Teachers

A detailed report will be submitted by Dr. Z[illegible], Director. We are actively seeking funding for this program for the next school year.

Special Project on Curriculum Materials for the Study of Black History

We are especially indebted to Mrs. Kathy Jones of our Board for her persistent encouragement for the initiation of this program. We are also indebted to Mrs. Jones for recommending as coordinator of this project Mrs. Vivian Johnson.

We now have very attractive brochures on METCO which are available to any who need them. David Sargent took this project on as his responsibility and we are most pleased with the results.

New Staff Members

Mrs. Betty Rose
Miss Eleanor Johnson
Mrs. Vivian Johnson - Special Consultant on Curriculum Materials

NEW PROGRAM FOR METCO

I. INTENT AND BACKGROUND

The New Careers Program is funded by the Department of Labor to provide training and careers for poverty persons in the human service agencies. Human service agencies are experiencing growing demands on the time of their professional positions with career opportunities. New Careers asks the human service agencies to reassess their job requirements in terms of their goals; it asks these agencies to consider the "life experiences" of people as strongly as they would formal credentials.

II. WHAT NEW CAREERS OFFERS.

A. It pays each trainee $1.92 /hr. for a 35-hour work week. The agency can supplement this wage if so desired.

B. New Careers provides two weeks of orientation/training which is tailored to the enrollee and to the agency, training which will motivate the enrollee to better job performance.

C. Once having been established in the program, the enrollee will be eligible for participation in basic education or college work programs.

D. It offers a training staff member (ABCD liaison) who works in cooperation with the agency, with the enrollee on a day-to-day basis.

E. New Careers is prepared to work with agencies in developing career ladders, in working with civil service quesitons and on the creation of new job categories.

III. WHAT WE LOOK FOR FROM AN AGENCY:

A. A willingness to review present staff structures and to choose entry level jobs with a career ladder.

B. The desire on the part of the immediate supervisor to work with the New Career's trainer in developing the content of the orientation/training and to work with the enrollee in his first training period.

C. To cooperate with the New Careers Education Specialist in determining what basic education or college work each enrollee is prepared for or needs.

D. To be open to all types of qualified applicants, not simply those with formal education.

Preliminary discussions were held with Mrs. Amanda Houston, Director New Careers Program, Dr. Sperber and staff members - Brookline, and myself. The Brookline School Committee has voted to participate in this program. Because of some of the METCO staff's special needs and more importantly belief in this program we would like to cooperate particularly with recruiting. I recommend that the Board approve our participation.

METCO'S FIRST GRADUATES
JUNE 1968

WELLESLEY

Paula Jackson - St. Aquinas School of Business, Paula has received a $1000 scholarship in Milton
Palmel Baker - Hampton Institute, Virginia, Palmel will be awarded the Ralph Hilton Scholarship
Pamela Modlin - University of Massachusetts, awarded a full tuition scholarship
Denise Scott - Boston College, awarded a scholarship
Aleta Male - Business School
Angela Lee - will enter the world of work

BROOKLINE

Thelma Bolling - University of Massachusetts

I would like to share with you a letter we received from one of our graduates. It is a pleasant note on which to close this report.

To Mrs. Batson and the METCO staff -

My family and I would like to acknowledge our sincere gratitude to you for allowing me the opportunity to participate in the METCO-Wellesley program.

During my years at Wellesley Senior High, it has given me a more realistic outlook on life and has helped me to plan for my future. If I had not been offered and accepted this opportunity I honestly do not think that I would have ever contemplated college and now I have been accepted.

The METCO program is a very good opportunity for all Negro students to walk up to and open a door that has never been opened before, except by very few ambitious Negroes.

Thank you again, but we could never thank you enough.

I would also like to wish you all the success that you may strive to achieve, and METCO will one day achieve its ultimate goal.

s/ High School Graduate

Respectfully Submitted
Ruth M. Batson
(Mrs. John C.)
Executive Director

RMB:jj
6/11/68

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

A Cooperative Program of Education
Between Urban and Suburban Schools
P.L. 89-10, Title III, Project #661405

Sociometric Status of
METCO Elementary School Children
as of January, 1967

Submitted by: Dr. David K. Archibald
Director, Research and
Evaluation
Metropolitan Council for
Educational Opportunity

June 18, 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Title	Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Analytical Design	3
III.	Administration of the Instrument	16
IV.	Data Processing	17
V.	Findings: The Index of Popularity	19
VI.	Findings: The Index of Reciprocation	31
VII.	Conclusions	40
	References	44

Appendices

A - Sociometric Questionnaire, Teacher Questionnaire and Instructions 45

B - A Simulated Choice Matrix and Roster of Scores 51

Acknowledgement is hereby made to Dr. Maxwell Schleiffer and his staff, who were responsible for collection and coding of the data reported herein.

ABSTRACT

In January, 1967, a sociometric questionnaire was administered to all students in 82 classrooms, grades three through six, among ten schools in two suburban towns near Boston. Subjects of the study were 71 black children from Boston bussed to the schools daily since September, 1966, as part of the METCO program. For comparison purposes, a sample of 115 students who had also entered the same schools the preceding September was identified. As indicators of social adjustment of the METCO children and of communication between them and their classmates, it was asked whether they were significantly different than (a) all other students and (b) other transfer students on measures of popularity and choice-reciprocation. The following conclusions were drawn from the data:

1. While METCO boys are significantly less popular than the Norm, they are still within the range of other transfer boys, who, on the other hand, are not significantly lower than the Norm.
2. While METCO girls are significantly less popular than the Norm, they are no different from other transfer girls, who are also significantly lower than the Norm.
3. METCO boys and girls, as well as other transfer students, show no differences from the Norm in the percentage of choices reciprocated.
4. METCO boys and girls show no differences from the Norm or from other transfer students in their reciprocal percentages after reciprocal choices with other METCO students are removed.

It was further noted that the lowest scores for METCO students were on the question which asked the names of playmates. Scores were significantly higher on questions about desired seatmates and best friend. The low popularity scores seemed, then, to be more attributable to the factors of nonresidency and newcomer status than to racial identity. It was finally pointed out that these conclusions are preliminary and that a more realistic assessment of METCO social status in the schools would depend on further sociometric data collected periodically over time.

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY
(METCO)
Research and Evaluation
178 Humboldt Avenue   Dorchester, Massachusetts   02121

June 18, 1968

Sociometric Status of
METCO Elementary School Children
as of January, 1967

I. Introduction

In September, 1966, 220 students from Boston entered 27 schools in seven suburban communities of Greater Boston, under the auspices of the Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity (METCO). METCO is a non-profit organization funded primarily by the U.S. Office of Education[1] and the Carnegie Foundation to provide "quality integrated education" for inner-city Negro and for suburban students. Of the students in the program during the year 1966-67, 218 were Negro and 2 were white.

The primary objective of the program has been to provide a better educational experience for the inner-city students. A preliminary report evaluating this factor has already been submitted (Archibald, 1967). A secondary objective has been to increase social contact and to enhance communication between black urban children and white suburban children. This objective has importance in two ways. To begin with, explicit and assumed values underlying the formation of METCO presume that such contact and communication is highly desirable. The benefits of the social experience are generally said to extend to the suburban students and schools primarily. (The truth of this assertion is not at issue here; in fact, the proposition may be untestable insofar as it is asserted as an ethical imperative rather than an empirical claim.) The objective is important from another direction, however. It is generally agreed that schools are not simply agents of academic training. Various kinds of socializing processes are usually gathered under the rubric of education. It is unlikely that these processes will take place for students who are not generally included as more or less ordinary members of the school social system. Furthermore, if a particular group of students were to encounter a distinctly rejective situation, their academic work would most likely suffer as well.

---

[1] P.L. 89-10, Title III, Project #661435

There is considerable warrant, then, for examining the extent and kind of social contact between the METCO students and their suburban classmates. Several procedures could be used--such as interviews, questionnaires, observations, etc. There is a major restriction in the distribution of the METCO sample which governs most of these approaches. At the elementary school level (grades K-6), the 1966-1967 sample of 125 students was distributed among four towns, seven grades and 20 schools. If children in grades K-2 are excluded (as being significantly more difficult to measure), there are then 95 students in three towns, four grades and 18 schools. Furthermore, this reduced sample is scattered among 58 classrooms, with an average of less than two METCO students per classroom. (That figure includes only those rooms with METCO students in them. If the entire school is considered as a base, the ratio of METCO students per classroom becomes infinitesimal, in that there are only slightly more than five students, on the average, per school). In fact, 30 of the students had no other METCO classmates; 42 had one other (but for only eight pairs were the mates of the same sex); and 23 students were in rooms with either three or four METCO children (seven classrooms).

To study the degree and nature of social interaction in METCO classrooms would be a large undertaking, if interviews, observations, elaborate questionnaires, and the like were used. On the other hand, it was considered unwise to take a subsample of the METCO students for intensive study given the very small N's per classroom. The compromise arrived at was to administer a relatively simple sociometric questionnaire in most of the METCO classrooms (as well as several non-

METCO rooms) and make from the responses some inferences about social interaction and communication.

This report describes findings for the measurement done in 1966-67. The bulk of the study concerns the first testing, made in January, 1967. Similar testing on a much greater scale has been performed three times during the school year 1967-1968. This present report is intended to lay the ground for reports to follow concerning the newer data. It is expected that the most valuable findings will be those concerning a time-span of at least a year. Findings reported below, then, are to a large extent tentative and partial.

II. Analytical Design

A. Rationale. The range of general questions regarding social adjustment of METCO students in their new schools can be reduced to the following, for the purposes of this study:

1. Are the METCO students regarded by their suburban classmates as typical students in the class, or are they perceived as members of a distinctively separate group? If the latter, what characterizes their differentness, and is it susceptible to change over time?
2. Is there evidence of affectively positive interaction between METCO and non-METCO students?

Certain important assumptions underlie the use of these questions. Insofar as a group of students is perceived and reacted to as different, in a social sense, from other students in the classes, their experience will be atypical. If the other students react negatively, if there is rejection, then the group's experience could be quite damaging for individuals. Furthermore, possibilities for communication between the two groups would be sharply reduced. It is beyond the scope of this evaluation to assess personality damage, but to the extent that the group members possessed a felt need for acceptance by the larger group, one might legitimately expect some distortion to occur. In the face of social rejection, METCO students might devise a number of individual strategies for coping and many would probably cope successfully. However, these strategies would necessarily be directed to resolving personal social needs and the METCO objective of breaking down the walls between urban and suburban, black and white would inevitably fail.

To move to a more concrete level, we must examine certain objective characteristics of the situation under evaluation. From the outset METCO students have been different from the vast majority of their classmates in two respects independent of individual traits. First, and probably of most importance, they are black, making them almost unique in the classrooms studied.[1] Second, they are non-residents of the towns where they attend school. As a consequence, they do not have the opportunities after school, on weekends, and during vacations to develop neighborhood relationships that children ordinarily would pursue. A factor associated with this second point is the manner by which they come and go. Since they arrive each morning and depart in the afternoons on busses, in groups, they are more likely to be seen as a separate group. In these objective ways, then, they tend to be labelled by circumstances as "different".

It is problematic how deeply this labelling carries. The low density of METCO students per classroom should reduce the tendency of others to see them exclusively as METCO. Their color, on the other hand, will most probably evoke the range of negative and superioristic stereotyped reactions of white to black children that apparently are already embedded by the first years of school (cf. Goodman, 1952). Thus, the label black would probably be more determining than the label METCO. The non-resident categorization probably bears little on suburban attitudes directly, but the fact of its existence necessarily reduces the amount of contact outside of school. The question reduces, then, to the extent to which individual personality features of the METCO students are more influential than the strong and probably negative circumstantial factors in defining their relationships with the suburban students.

Although the line of analysis outlined herein cannot control uniquely for the non-resident situation, it is possible to provide a control simultaneously for the two factors of race and residence. One further category that might be used to define the METCO students is their status as transfer students, new students to their particular schools when they enter. Each year in every school other transfer students enter who are most likely to share characteristics common to students in that school. In the suburban schools under discussion, they would most probably be white and middle-class; also, they would almost certainly be residents of their new school districts. Assuming any transfer student would show a low sociometric status on entrance, we have access to a meaningful group for comparison with the METCO students.

---

[1] Hard figures on the numbers of black suburban students in the same classrooms have proven difficult to acquire. Ordinarily, there were no more than two or three black suburban students in a given school; in several schools there were none.

We would assume that all other things being equal, any two groups of newcomers randomly assigned on the first day of school would have statistically equivalent popularity levels, considerably lower for either group than for the other students. Furthermore, we would also predict that mean scores for these two groups would approach the norm at about the same rates. Perhaps in two years (or whatever interval in fact obtains), the two groups would be indistinguishable from the norm. In fact, they would after their first year be constituent parts of the norm for comparison against a new set of newcomers. On the other hand, if one of the newcomer groups did not approach the norm as rapidly as the other, then we would presume it contained a sample of students systematically and negatively differentiated by the norm students on one or more characteristics. Assuming that personality characteristics are randomly distributed among the two groups to begin with, then the characteristics involved must be some feature of their objective situation. We know, in advance, however, that certain very important aspects of the METCO students' situation are likely to lead to a differential and somewhat negative perception of them by the other students. In fact, we would predict for the METCO sample lower scores at the outset than for a comparison sample of newcomers. If the METCO sample approaches the norm at a slower rate, or fails to approach it at all, then we would conclude that objective group factors had precedence over individual personality traits in determining their popularity with other students.

In order to evaluate the Basic Questions, a conventional sociometric questionnaire was chosen. Sociometric testing has a substantial history and literature in the United States. Although sociometric techniques had been used in prior years, the great impetus to the field was provided during the 1930's with the publication of J. L. Moreno's Who Shall Survive? (Moreno, 1934; revised 1953). A professional journal (Sociometry) was founded shortly thereafter. A set of techniques were derived largely devoted to measuring the strength and patterns of social relationships in small and larger group situations. School classrooms have regularly been an arena for sociometric study, and most elementary school teachers receive at least an introductory briefing in techniques of measurement and interpretation.

According to one definition, a "sociometric test is a means for determining the degree to which individuals are accepted in a group" (Northway, 1952, p. 1). Further important definitions of the situation are outlined by Moreno as follows:

> The theory of sociometric testing requires: (a) that the participants in the situation are drawn to one another by one or more criteria, (b) that a criterion is selected to which the participants are bound to respond, at the moment of the test, with a high degree of spontaneity, (c) that the subjects are adequately motivated so that their responses may be sincere....
>
> (Moreno, 1953 (1934), p. 99)

Questionnaires of this sort have been used in thousands of studies in the past to measure, among other things, popularity, isolation and mutual interactions for groups and individuals within groups. Both the reliability and the validity of sociometric measures have been determined acceptable (Mouton, et al, 1960 (a) and 1960 (b)).

The questionnaire selected contained the following criterial questions:

1. What five (boys, girls) in this class do you play with?
2. What five (boys, girls) in this class would you most like to sit next to, if you had the opportunity to choose?
3. Which (boy, girl) in this class is your closest friend?

There are probably two levels of criteria in the three questions. One is a general association/popularity index, in which the first two questions are dominant. The other is a closer measure of intimacy: we would assume that choices made on the third question would represent a greater affective commitment than on the first two. For this report, these level differences will be referred to only in passing. Other analytical differences among the criteria will be utilized in the analysis. Thus, the factual nature of the first question will be contrasted with the explicitly preferential component of the second and the implicitly preferential nature of the third. The distinction is important in sorting out the importance of non-residency in the METCO sample.

For each question a criterion score for a given student can be derived based on the number of times he was named by his classmates. This can be construed as a popularity index, or more generally, as an index of social acceptance. On the basis of these scores, we will be in a position to assess the first Basic Question (above, p. 3).

An important aspect of sociometric analysis is the access afforded to reciprocal feelings between any two students. Thus, when A chooses B as a playmate, we assume that A holds B in some esteem. If B also chooses A, we then infer mutual esteem; furthermore, we expect that this mutual esteem reflects the existence of a relationship, further implying that some kind of affectively positive communication exists between the two. The depth and complexity (e.g., ambivalence) of this relationship cannot, of course, be determined with the relatively simple instruments being used here. The very existence of communication, however, can be measured with the sociometric questionnaire, and a score of reciprocality can be computed for use in assessing the second Basic Question.

B. Hypotheses. Specific hypotheses to be tested are defined in this section. In all cases, analysis is reported separately for boys and girls by town and for towns combined. Occasionally, differences between towns will be useful for analysis and consequently reported. A more intriguing difference, that between grades, cannot be dealt with at this time because of the small N's per grade.

The following hypotheses will be tested:

1. There are no significant differences between the scores of METCO and non-METCO students.
2. There are no significant differences between the scores of METCO and other transfer students.
3. There are no significant differences between the scores of other transfer students and non-transfer students.

Each hypothesis refers to each of the two criteria--popularity and reciprocality. Data will be reported and conclusions drawn separately for the two criteria. Within each category, no attempt will be made to combine the scores for the three questions, since the substantive differences among them may provide useful analytically. Findings for each subgroup by town and sex will be given, but conclusions relevant to the hypotheses will be made on the basis of findings separately by sex with towns combined. The hypotheses, that is, will be analyzed in terms of METCO boys, METCO girls, transfer boys, transfer girls, and norm boys and girls. Each major hypothesis, therefore, refers to twelve minor hypotheses: two categories of criteria; three questions; and two sex groups. When findings for a given criterion and sex group are mixed among the three questions, analytical distinctions will be made for clarification, but a global conclusion will be drawn based on the predominant direction of the findings. For example, if METCO boys were significantly below the transfer boys in Question I popularity scores (first criterion), but no significant differences between the two groups were found on the other two questions, the global conclusion would be that Hypothesis Two had been confirmed for that subgroup. Attempts would also be made to explain the discrepancy in the findings.

To determine the relevance of the findings to the Basic Questions (above, p.3), the following conditions are meaningful:

(a) If all three hypotheses are confirmed, METCO students are, like any set of transfer students selected randomly, not negatively[1] distinguished by their classmates.

(b) If Hypothesis Two is confirmed, but Hypotheses One and Three are not, then METCO students, like any set of transfer students selected randomly, are negatively distinguished by their classmates.

(c) If Hypothesis Three is confirmed, but Hypotheses One and Two are not, then METCO students, unlike any random set of transfer students, are negatively distinguished by their classmates.

(d) If Hypotheses Two and Three are confirmed, but Hypothesis One is not, then METCO students, while within the range of randomly selected transfer scores, are, unlike the transfer students, negatively distinguished by their classmates. The difference between (c) and (d) is important in that while METCO students are significantly low in each case while transfer students are not, under condition (c) METCO students are significantly lower than transfer students also. This condition would place METCO students in a category substantially different from transfer students; under condition (d), they could be construed as falling within the low-scoring range of transfer students.

---

[1] In this section, it has been assumed that neither METCO nor transfer students would score significantly higher than the norm. The possibility that this assumption might be disproved will not be taken into account at this time.

(e) If all three hypotheses are not confirmed, then METCO students, like random transfer students, are negatively distinguished by their classmates, but are distinguished significantly lower than transfer students and hence represent a separate group. This condition is analagous to condition (c), but represents a sharply more negative response to the Basic Questions.

Other combinations of the three hypotheses either are unlikely or verge on the absurd. The same five conditions apply equally to analysis for either criterion.

C. Instrument and Statistical Treatment.

1. The instrument used was a questionnaire taken practically verbatim from one used in the evaluation of a cooperative project between the Judge Baker Clinic in Boston and the City of Newton (Mass.) public schools. This project, evaluation of which was headed by Drs. James Teele and Maxwell Schleiffer, found the instrument of considerable value in identifying changes in the social status of students with emotional problems being treated in a special therapeutic program by the Baker Clinic (Teele, Schleiffer, *et al*, 196). A copy of the complete instrument is included in Appendix A. For the purposes of this report, only Questions 1, 2 and 4 on the students' questionnaire (page 1) are relevant. They will hereafter be referred to as Questions I, II and III.

Responses to each of the three questions were restricted to members of the same sex and classroom of the respondent. Question I asked what five children the respondent played with most of the time; Question II asked what five children the respondent would most like to sit next to in class; Question III asked who was the respondent's best friend in the classroom. The instructions specified no importance in the order of names, and students were not required to include all five names. If more than five were given, only the first five were coded.

Other data taken at the same included the occupation of the student's father; his own occupational preference; and a list of twelve values on which the respondend was to indicate which attributes among them were important for him in his friends. Teachers were also asked to name the most popular, helpful, unpopular and disruptive boys and girls (three blanks were provided for each category); no instruction was given to complete all blanks.

2. The initial statistical problem was to derive an appropriate criterion score. It has been conventional in sociometric analysis to divide the number of times a student is chosen by others by the number of times he could possibly have been chosen. This procedure was rejected in the present study for two reasons. To begin with, early scrutiny of the data revealed that the mean number of choices per classroom varied widely. Values would occasionally go lower than 2.0 and as high as 5.0. The probability of being chosen would be lower in a group with a lower mean number of choices. The mean number of choices was apparently unrelated to class (or sex group) size. If we could have adequate assurance that classroom conditions were identical in every case, a reasonable argument might be made that the choices made represented an actual maximum number of choices in the minds of the students. Since the questionnaire was administered by classroom teachers, it is possible that some deviation from directions occured, especially in the direction of encouraging a class to fill in all empty blanks. Since the METCO and Newcomer samples are small relative to the rest of the students, artificial components of the scores ought to be restricted as far as possible. Therefore, a different computation of score was desirable.

In the second place, since the scores were to be subjected to parametric statistical tests assuming normality, any transformation that would approximate normal distribution would be desirable. The conventional sociometric scores appear to have a form of the Poisson distribution. A simple transformation was adopted. Within each classroom sex group, the total times a student was chosen was transformed to a standard *z*-score. For each group, then, the mean would be 0.00 and the standard deviation 1.00. Given the small N's within classes, the values might not be exact; however, they are close, and when scores are combined across classes, the values are very close to the theoretical values. A relatively minor advantage obtains from this procedure in that the scores appear in the form of positive and negative deviations around a zero mean, making them relatively easy to interpret. Furthermore, for any individual score, one can determine the probability of random deviation from zero of an individual score from a conventional table of normal curve functions.

Derivation of an index of reciprocation was more conventional. The number of times a student is chosen is divided into the number of those choices that are reciprocated. The index can range from 0.00 to 1.00. For example, a student chosen five times reciprocates two of these choices. His index of reciprocation is .400. For convenience, the two indices will be referred to as the I.P. (Index of Popularity) and the I.R. (Index of Reciprocation). They are the criterion measures for this study.

Comparison among the different groups under investigation will be made for pairs of the groups separately by the t-test of the difference between means. When comparing two relatively small samples, the t-test of independent means is used. When one of the samples is large (e.g., the norm group, numbering typically in the hundreds), it's mean is taken as a zero reference and the t-test against a zero-reference is used. While the t-test is a relatively simple statistical analysis, it is sufficient to deal with the hypotheses given above (page 7). These can be reduced to the general form: what is the probability that Group A and Group B were randomly chosen from the same underlying population? A probability of .05 or less will be regarded as significant. Probabilities between .10 and .05 will be reported, however, because in this initial study they may signify trends that will develop in subsequent data.

The t-test assumes normal distribution in the underlying characteristic measured, but moderate departures from normality have no serious effect on the test. Because the I.P. scores are standardized transformations of the original choice values, their distribution is normal by definition. The I.R. scores for Questions I and II appear to be distributed reasonably close to the normal curve; scores for Question III are somewhat skewed, however, especially in the smaller samples. Conclusions drawn from Question III findings will have to be somewhat more tentative.

D. The Samples. The total sample consisted of students in 78 classrooms from 12 schools and two school systems. Table II-1 shows the distribution of classrooms by town and grade.

Table II-1

Distribution of Classrooms by Town and Grade

	GRADE				
Town	3	4	5	6	Total
A	10	11	12	4	37
B	11	14	14	2	41
Total	21	25	26	6	78

There are three categories within the sample studied of interest in this report: METCO students, other transfer students, and all non-transfer students. They will be referred to hereafter respectively as METCO, Newcomers, and the Norm. Table II-2 shows the distribution by town, grade and sex of METCO and Newcomer samples.

Table II-2

Distribution of METCO and Newcomers
by Grade, Sex and Town

			GRADE								
			3		4		5		6		
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	TOTAL
Town B:											
	Boys:	METCO	7	53.8	2	15.4	4	30.8	0	0.0	13
		New	13	35.1	10	27.0	12	32.4	2	5.4	37
	Girls:	METCO	5	33.3	5	33.3	3	20.0	2	13.4	15
		New	9	26.4	11	32.4	12	35.3	2	5.9	34
Town C:											
	Boys:	METCO	7	35.0	11	55.0	2	10.0	0	0.0	20
		New	10	47.6	5	23.8	4	19.0	2	9.5	21
	Girls:	METCO	5	21.7	9	39.2	7	30.4	2	8.7	23
		New	11	47.8	6	26.1	4	17.4	2	8.7	23

Although there are some disproportions between the two samples by grade, these become less prominent if grades three and four are combined and compared with grades five and six combined. Given that combination, possible effects of grade differences on differences between scores of the two samples are largely controlled for.

Differentiation within the samples will be based on town and sex only, since the grade-group N's are quite small. Further differentiation by presumed motivation, previous educational experience, previous social experience, etc., is not possible because the data are unobtainable for the Newcomer sample. Subsequent analysis of the METCO sample will deal with some of these and other independent variables in attempting to ascertain factors associated with high and low sociometric status. Analysis of 1967-1968 data will permit differentiation by grade-level for both groups and by place of prior residence for Newcomers (outside of town/within town), because the samples will be considerably larger.

E. Some General Considerations. The present report will deal only with scores secured in January, 1967, roughly five months after the METCO and Newcomer students entered their new schools. By themselves, scores reported here cannot satisfactorily deal with the hypotheses in question. The more significant analysis must take place over time, in which rates of change in mean scores will be revealed. Data secured in June, 1967, were not as complete as the January set. Therefore, analysis of the June data will be reported only in connection with results of the three testings in 1967-1968.

As time reveals the patterns of integration into the whole student body of the two groups of transfer students, other variables become important. For students whose sociometric status either remains or becomes low it would be desirable to search for those symptoms of distress which have been found elsewhere to accompany low sociometric status (Mouton, et al, 1960, 384-385). It would also be desirable to look for individual strategies and group strategies that become devised to overcome the effects of isolation (e.g., increased within-group interaction and cohesion).

It is important to add a cautionary note regarding low sociometric status. One investigator (Northway, 1960) studied 80 fifth and sixth grade children for two years, using several instruments (school records, psychological interviews, academic testing, time sample studies of class participation, observational records of informal interaction, children's compositions, and sociometric testing, among others); she arrived at certain crucial distinctions among low-scorers. In the lowest quartile of scores there was a wide range of personality characteristics and socio-economic backgrounds found. The only measured variable that distinguished them from the other students was that they were the least accepted, sociometrically.

More intensive scrutiny of the individual students led the research team to define three mutually exclusive categories with which to describe the low-scorers. Two of these categories are defined by behaviors usually regarded as symptomatic of some kind of personality distress. The *recessive cases* were generally listless, below average physical standards, careless of their appearance and possessions, and not very interested in the world around them. The *socially ineffective cases* tended to have apparently opposite characteristics in that they were very active, indeed to the point of being consistent behavior problems: "noisy, rebellious, delinquent in classroom affairs, boastful and arrogant....a nuisance to the teacher and to the life of the classroom" (*ibid*, 458). They apparently were trying to compensate for a failure to establish meaningful relationships by calling attention to themselves.

A third group was defined, however, as *socially uninterested children*. Although these children were not generally accepted by their classmates, they neither demonstrated the need for acceptance characteristic of the second group nor the apathy and withdrawal of the first group. They maintained a wide range of interests and involvements which were of a personal nature rather than a social, such as art, music, science, hobbies and reading. They may have been relatively uninterested in their classmates, sometimes bored with them, occasionally critical or observant in a detached way. For these students, the social life of the classroom was not a necessary part of their lives, which otherwise appeared to be reasonably satisfactory to them.

It is important to keep this third group in mind when considering low scorers. In the first place, low sociometric status is not necessarily a sign of a pathological condition. Furthermore, in a situation where low sociometric status may be the result of objective factors (e.g., race and residence) rather than personality components, characteristics of the third group may be adopted as a strategy by the students involved. Naturally, in the case of METCO students, if this were to occur certain important goals of the program would not be met. On the other hand, impairment of the students' functioning is not necessarily to be inferred, either. Low sociometric status must be regarded as one of several possible indices of important consequences in the lives of children taking part in a program such as METCO.

III. *Administration of the Instrument*

Initially, it was planned to give the questionnaire on two different occasions to the same set of classrooms. Unexpected administrative difficulties forced cancellation of the January testing for Town A and the June testing for Town C. The present report encompasses findings for the January testing only.[1]

Questionnaires were packaged in large envelopes, with enough forms in each envelope for one classroom. The package also included instructions and a questionnaire for the teacher. Administration of the questionnaires varied by town, according to the desires of the school principals. In Town B, it was felt that an outside investigator would secure better responses from the classes. Consequently, a member of the staff which had contracted to secure the data directed the process in Town B classrooms. Principals in Town C felt that the classroom teachers would be more effective, and consequently the teachers were in charge in Town C. Instructions were explained thoroughly in Town C to the school principals by members of the investigating staff.

In any given school, the instrument was administered to all classrooms at any grade level which contained METCO students. This was done for two reasons. Both the school authorities and the METCO investigative staff were averse to any steps which might suggest to students that particular attention was directed toward METCO students. The instrument was called a "friendship questionnaire" and the study described as a study of "how friendships are formed." Testing only in rooms with METCO students might well have given cues as to what friendships in particular were under study. In the second place, a substantial number of rooms at each level containing METCO students was desired in order to secure meaningful Norm and Newcomer samples.

A complete set of the instrument can be found in Appendix A, including instructions to the teacher (or whoever was to supervise the administration). Although a five-minute time limit was indicated for the sociometric questions, this was not adhered to rigidly so that slower students would not be cut short. Students in the upper grades were generally finished well within the time limit. Students absent on the scheduled day were given the questionnaire individually by the teacher upon returning to school. A handful of chronic or long-term absentees did not receive the questionnaire.

---

[1] The January sample of METCO students contained 71 children; for June the equivalent number was 43. The larger sample also embraced a wider grade range.

The best index available to determine teacher and student attitude toward the task is the frequency of whimsical responses (from students) and non-completed questionnaires (from teachers). None of the student forms showed overt signs of resistance. Of the total of 125 classrooms tested (37 of them twice), only five teacher questionnaires were returned uncompleted, and four of these represented the same two teachers on two different occasions. Therefore, only three of the 88 teachers involved indicated open reluctance to participate. In one known case the opposition was not to the sociometric assignment but rather to the teacher questionnaire itself. In the many subsequent contacts between METCO and the school no comments critical of the assignment *per se* have been reported. In fact, there has been no difficulty at all in arranging three administrations of the same questionnaire during 1967-1968 in all of the same schools, typically involving more rooms in each school. It seems fair to assume that motivation for the task was sufficient to meet the specifications indicated above (p. 6).

IV. Data Processing

A. *Coding*. Coding of the questionnaires was performed with the following objectives: (1) the available data could be transferred to 80-column tabulating cards; (2) mutual choices could be ascertained; (3) a choice matrix could be computed for each question and each classroom which would show who named who and which choices were reciprocal; give the total choices for each student; and differentiate boys from girls and METCO students from non-METCO students. Appendix B contains a sample choice matrix for all three coded questions for one classroom. While the matrices were not fundamental to the analysis described below, they are an excellent visual representation of the choices made within a class. Furthermore, while the computer program used in analysis of the data was in the process of being perfected, the matrices were used to compile certain data for Newcomers reported below.

In setting up the code, each classroom was assigned a unique number; each student within a room was given a number unique within the room; furthermore, the student's number indicated his sex and METCO status, in that numbers 1-29 were reserved for non-METCO boys, 30-49 for non-METCO girls, 50-59 for METCO boys, and 60-69 for METCO girls. The numbering system has been changed in later versions of the system.

Coding was supervised (and also largely carried out) by a single person, with occasional assistance from three other persons. Code sheets were spot-checked for accuracy and found adequate. The data were then punched into tabulating cards.

B. Data Analysis. A computer program was developed which would provide the following information: matrices with certain summary data as described immediately above (and see also Appendix B), on a separate page, first choices and z-scores (as described above, p. 10) for each of the three questions for all students in the class; a new data card punched for each student containing all of the original information plus the three z-scores. Output from this program supplied data for all subsequent analysis.[1]

This analysis was performed in two ways. Computations of distributions and t-tests involving the Index of Popularity were made using the Datatext computer routines developed by the Harvard Department of Social Relations. Analysis involving the Index of Reciprocation were made by members of the METCO evaluation staff from visual inspection of the matrices, using desk calculators for the actual computations. Computations were checked carefully for human error.

V. Findings: The Index of Popularity

The following sections will report findings separately for each of the three groups involved: METCO students (METCO), other newcomers (Newcomers); and all other students in the classes (Norm). Tests of differences between means will than be reported. Unless otherwise indicated, all data reported are from the January testing only.

It will be recalled that the Index of Popularity (I.P.) was computed by transforming the total number of times chosen (per student, per question) into a z-score based on the choice totals of same-sex students within the given classroom. For any given group, the mean will be 0.00 and the standard deviation, 1.00 (approximately, given the small group sizes). When groups are combined across classrooms, the theoretical values for the mean and s.d. are very closely approximated.

---

[1] The program was written by Edward Kelly, a graduate student at Harvard University, based on the program written by Richard Labrie for the Newton-Baker Project. Kelly's program has undergone major revisions since the version reported here.

A. METCO. Table V-1 shows the mean scores and related data for the METCO sample, by town and sex.

Table V-1

METCO Popularity Scores, By Town and Sex

Question No.	Town and Sex	N	Mean	Variance
One	B - Boys	13	- .78	1.084
	Girls	15	- .58	.890
	C - Boys	20	- .50	.544
	Girls	23	- .88	.428
Two	B - Boys	13	- .37	1.305
	Girls	15	- .41	.685
	C - Boys	20	- .20	.857
	Girls	23	- .64	.491
Three	B - Boys	13	- .45	.728
	Girls	15	- .22	.612
	C - Boys	20	- .27	.688
	Girls	23	- .42	.438

The mean scores are all negative, most commonly below -.40 when the sample is grouped by town and sex. The only groups to approach the Norm are Town C boys on Questions II and III and Town B girls on Question III. There are some interesting features about these scores. In the first place, with only one exception all means for boys are closer to the Norm (assumed to be 0.00 by definition; actually, Norm scores ranged from +.01 to +.05 because of the consistently negative METCO scores) than are those for girls. The June data (not reported here) support this trend. Tests of significance for data combined across towns, as given in Table V-2, show that the trend is by no means significant statistically (although it may have theoretical importance).

None of the t's approaches significance. Even when broken down by town, none of the differences between boys and girls is significant, nor are the differences all in the same direction. In fact, only in Town C on Questions I and II do the boys' scores approach a significant level of difference. At best there seems to be somewhat of a tendency for boys to have higher scores than girls.

Table V-2

METCO Popularity Scores, By Sex (Towns Combined)

Tests of Difference Between Boys and Girls

Question No.	Sex	N	Mean	Variance	t	prob.
One	Boys	33	- .61	.748	1.00	ns
	Girls	38	- .77	.613		
Two	Boys	33	- .27	1.006	1.34	ns
	Girls	38	- .55	.565		
Three	Boys	33	- .34	.690	0.00	ns
	Girls	38	- .34	.501		

The second interesting point to be seen in the two tables above is the extent to which Question I scores consistently are lower than scores for either of the other two questions. Question I is a question of fact: who do you play with? Question II asks for a preference: Who would you like to sit beside in class? Question III asks who is your best friend in class? Table V-3 summarizes the t-test results of the differences among the questions (differences between II and III were omitted as being trivial).

Table V-3

Differences Between Question Means for METCO Popularity Scores

Town and Sex	Mean Diff[1] I & II	t	prob.	Mean Diff[1] I & III	t	prob.
B - Boys	- .41	2.77	.02*	- .33	1.23	.24
Girls	- .17	1.000	n.s.	- .36	2.49	.03*
C - Boys	- .30	1.28	.22	-.23	1.18	.25
Girls	- .24	2.05	.05*	- .46	2.46	.02*
			Towns Combined, By Sex			
Boys	- .34	2.25	.03*	- .27	1.72	.10
Girls	- .22	1.92	.06	- .43	3.35	.002**
			Sexes Combined, By Town			
B	- .26	2.04	.05*	- .34	2.43	.02*
C	- .27	2.16	.04*	- .36	2.63	.02*
			All Groups Combined			
All METCO	- .27	2.97	.004**	- .35	3.56	.001***

[1] Value given for Mean Difference is difference between means

With only a few exceptions, the differences between Question I and the other two are significant. This is true for all METCO students combined; for all four combinations by town; two of four combinations by sex-group; and four of eight town by sex-group subcategories. Consequently, there appears to be a significant effect operating in the METCO sample which depresses Question I scores relative to these for the other questions.

Two further points emerge from Table V-3, although not with the same force. For boys, Question I scores were somewhat closer to Question III than to Question II scores; the reverse is true for girls and to a greater degree. Secondly, there are virtually no differences between towns, with sexes combined, for each of the difference scores. In fact, by extrapolating from Table V-1, it can be seen that the original METCO scores for each question are virtually identical for each town when sexes are combined. That is to say, despite somewhat differential tendencies between sexes within towns, when sex-groups are combined the METCO sample shows virtually the same set of scores in each town.

B. Newcomers. Table V-4 shows the mean scores and related data for the Newcomer sample. On the whole, the scores are closer to the mean than the METCO scores (tests of significance between the two groups are reported below). There is, however, a marked difference between the two towns. All scores for Town B are relatively close to the theoretical Norm of 0.00, but those for Town C are considerably below. For the METCO sample, there was only a small reflection of this difference in that Town B girls were always higher than Town C girls. Beyond the difference between the two towns, Town B scores are impressively close to the Norm. Differences between the two towns (sexes combined) are significant on Question I ($p < .05$) and approaching significance on the other two ($.10 > p > .05$). There does seem to be a sex difference in both towns, similar to the METCO scores, with boys generally scoring higher than girls. Combining across towns, as in the lower part of Table V-4, this effect is clearly present. As with the METCO sample, however, the differences are in no cases significant.

Table V-4

Newcomer Popularity Scores

By Town and Sex

Question No.	Town and Sex	N	Mean	Variance
One	B - Boys	37	- .01	.859
	Girls	34	- .29	.663
	C - Boys	21	- .47	.531
	Girls	23	- .61	.833
Two	B - Boys	37	- .08	1.014
	Girls	34	- .09	.643
	C - Boys	21	- .27	.631
	Girls	23	- .50	.924
Three	B - Boys	37	+ .07	.901
	Girls	34	- .27	.589
	C - Boys	21	- .44	.546
	Girls	23	- .33	.769
		Towns Combined		
One	Boys	58	- .18	.740
	Girls	57	- .42	.732
Two	Boys	58	- .14	.875
	Girls	57	- .24	.756
Three	Boys	58	- .11	.772
	Girls	57	- .30	.662

The differences between Question I scores and those for other questions found in the METCO sample are reflected only slightly in the Newcomer scores. It clearly does not exist for the boys, with a maximum difference of only .07. For girls, the trend is in the right direction and to a degree somewhat greater than boys. Compared with the METCO differences, however, even the girls show minor differences between questions.

C. Differences Between METCO, Newcomers, and the Norm. Means reported in the previous two sections are for the most part below the theoretical Norm mean of 0.00. There is considerable value in testing the significance of the differences. Conceptually, there are three distinct groups of students under consideration: METCO students, regular transfer students who have never attended the school before, and those students who have been in the school since at least sometime in the year 1965-66. If testing had been done in October, 1966, we would predict with considerable certainty that the sociometric questions would sharply distinguish the first two groups from the last. Furthermore, we would expect that the second group--the Newcomers--would tend to become gradually less distinct from the Norm, although we do not know at what rate. We are not able to make predictions about the METCO students, though. The *t*-test will give the probabilities that the three groups represent different underlying populations (at the time of the test). As is conventional in this type of investigation, a probability of .05 will be stipulated as the critical level of significance. Because this decision is relatively arbitrary, probabilities between .10 and .05 will be reported but not judged significant.

Because data processing involving METCO students was performed on a high-speed computer, but that involving Newcomers was done by hand with desk calculators, there are slight discrepancies in the Norm sample data. Thus, the Norm sample for METCO students was all non-METCO students (including Newcomers), while the Norm for Newcomers was all non-Newcomers (including METCO). In each case, the Norm includes the other sample. This was not judged to be important because the Norm was composed of more than 1700 cases, and the numbers of either METCO or Newcomer involved were small by comparison. Table V-5 shows the *t*-test results (against a zero reference) for the METCO sample.

Means for all groups on Question I were significantly lower than the Norm. For the other two questions, only girls from Town C were significantly low. The difference in scores between Question I and Questions II and III is thus reflected in the significance of differences from the Norm. When data from the two towns are combined, on the other hand, all but one of the means is significantly low. Only boys in Question II could still be regarded as representing the same underlying population as the Norm. Furthermore, when all METCO students are combined for each question, every mean is significantly lower than the Norm with probabilities of random difference less than .001.

Table V-5

T-Test of Differences Between METCO Popularity Score and the Norm (Zero Reference)

Question	Town and Sex	N	Mean	t	prob.
One	B - Boys	13	- .73	2.796	.02*
	Girls	15	- .58	2.458	.03*
	C - Boys	20	- .50	3.163	.01 p .001**
	Girls	23	- .88	6.827	.001***
Two	B - Boys	13	- .37	1.240	n.s.
	Girls	15	- .41	1.929	n.s.
	C - Boys	20	- .20	1.034	n.s.
	Girls	23	- .64	4.649	.001***
Three	B - Boys	13	- .45	1.998	.10 p .05(n.s.)
	Girls	15	- .22	1.110	n.s.
	C - Boys	20	- .27	1.499	n.s.
	Girls	23	- .42	3.174	.01 p .001**
			Towns Combined		
One	Boys	33	- .64	4.29	.001***
	Girls	38	- .79	6.11	.001***
Two	Boys	33	- .29	1.64	n.s.
	Girls	38	- .57	4.66	.001***
Three	Boys	33	- .36	2.47	.02 p .01*
	Girls	38	- .36	2.95	.01 p .001**

*The mean value given is actually the difference between the sample and the norm means. The latter varied from +.01 to +.05.

In summary, then, when METCO students are taken as a group they appear to represent a different population according to our measures than the other students in their schools. When differentiated by town and sex, on the other hand, certain of the subgroups are not significantly different from the Norm. Boys, in general, have higher scores than girls; boys in Town C, especially, have higher scores; and boys and girls in both towns have higher scores on Questions II and III than they do on Question I.

The results for Newcomers, as presented in Table V-6 are not strikingly different.

Table V-6

Differences Between the Newcomer Popularity Scores and the Norm (Town Reference)

Question	Town and Sex	N	Mean*	t	prob.
One	B - Boys	37	- .04	.26	n.s.
	Girls	34	- .32	2.29	.05 p .02*
	C - Boys	21	- .49	3.08	.01 p .001**
	Girls	23	- .66	3.45	.01 p .001**
Two	B - Boys	37	- .10	.60	n.s.
	Girls	34	- .10	.73	n.s.
	C - Boys	21	- .27	1.56	n.s.
	Girls	23	- .50	2.49	.02 p .01*
Three	B - Boys	37	+.06	.36	n.s.
	Girls	34	- .28	2.15	.05 p .02*
	C - Boys	21	- .46	2.15	.05 p .02*
	Girls	23	- .34	1.85	.10 p .05 (n.s.)
			Towns Combined		
One	Boys	58	- .20	1.71	n.s.
	Girls	57	- .46	4.00	.001***
Two	Boys	58	- .16	1.29	n.s.
	Girls	57	- .27	2.35	.05 p .02*
Three	Boys	58	- .13	1.09	n.s.
	Girls	57	- .31	2.88	.01 p .001**

*See footnote regarding difference between means, Table V-5, immediately above.

Only Town B boys are consistently within the range of the Norm. On Question I, the other groups show scores approaching those of the METCO sample and, like the METCO scores, significantly lower than the Norm. Also, for Question II, Newcomers reflect the METCO scores in that only Town C girls are significantly low. However, Town B Newcomers on that question have mean scores

128

around -.10, while the METCO scores are around -.40 (and must be near the limit of significant difference). On Question III, the Newcomers are somewhat different from the METCO sample. While one of four METCO subgroups is significantly low (again, Town C girls), two of the Newcomer groups are low (in each instance another group falls in the range between .10 and .05 probabilities). The METCO sample shows a slight superiority, therefore, on Question III. The difference between boys and girls, noted in the METCO sample, is clearly seen among the Newcomers as well, when scores for towns are combined: in all cases, girls are significantly lower than the Norm, while boys are not.

To summarize the results so far, Newcomers and METCO are similar in that they tend to score lower than the Norm; this effect is strongest and most consistant for Town C girls in both samples; both samples also tend to show lower scores on Question I than on the other two questions. On the other hand, METCO scores tend to be lower than the Newcomers overall; this is most true for Town B boys on all questions. Although the METCO scores are slightly better on Question III, this superiority vanishes when towns are combined, at which point all METCO groups are significantly below the Norm, while only Newcomer girls are similarly low.

To make comparison between the two samples more precise, Table V-7 presents the *t*-test results.

Despite the tendency for METCO scores to be lower than Newcomer scores, the *t*-tests show that the degree is generally non-significant. When grouped by town and sex, only Newcomer boys on Question I are significantly higher than their METCO equivalents. When towns are combined, the effect is found to hold for girls also on Question I. In all other cases, however, there are no significant differences between the two sets of scores.

Table V-7

Differences between METCO and Newcomer Popularity Scores*

Question	Town and Sex	Mean Scores METCO	Newcomer	t	prob.
One	B - Boys	- .78	- .01	2.50	.02>p >.01*
	Girls	- .58	- .29	1.1[illegible]	n.s.
	C - Boys	- .5[illegible]	- .47	0.13	n.s.
	Girls	- .88	- .61	1.15	n.s.
Two	B - Boys	- .37	- .08	.86	n.s.
	Girls	- .41	- .09	1.28	n.s.
	C - Boys	- .2[illegible]	- .27	0.[illegible]7	n.s.
	Girls	- .64	- .50	0.32	n.s.
Three	B - Boys	- .45	+ .07	1.74	n.s.
	Girls	- .22	- .27	0.21	n.s.
	C - Boys	- .27	- .44	0.69	n.s.
	Girls	- .42	- .33	0.39	n.s.
			Towns Combined		
One	Boys	- .61	- .18	2.26	.05>p >.02*
	Girls	- .77	- .42	2.02	.05>p >.02*
Two	Boys	- .27	- .14	0.62	n.s.
	Girls	- .55	- .24	1.79	n.s.
Three	Boys	- .34	- .11	1.22	n.s.
	Girls	- .34	- .30	0.25	n.s.

*N's and variances omitted for convenience, but included in earlier tables.

D. The Index of Popularity: Summary and Discussion. METCO popularity scores were found to be below the Norm in all cases. The differences were significant for all groups on Question I and for Town C girls in Questions II and III. When towns were combined, however, all the differences became significant except for boys on Question II. Newcomer scores also were below the Norm, with one exception--Town B boys on Question III. The differences were in no instance significant for Town B boys; always significant for Town C girls; and significant on two of three questions each for Town B girls and Town C boys. When towns were combined, boys were not significantly lower on any question; girls were significantly lower on all three questions. Newcomer scores were higher than METCO scores in all but three occasions

(Town C boys on Question II and Question III; Town B girls on Question III), and two of the three were trivial differences. On the other hand, the differences were all statistically non-significant except in the case of Town B boys on Question I. When towns were combined, both Newcomer boys and girls are significantly higher on Question I, but not on any other question.

It appears that the METCO and Newcomer samples bear a close resemblance sociometrically. Each shows the greatest deviation from the Norm on Question I; Newcomers are slightly further from the Norm on Question III; the differences between the two samples are for the most part non-significant. Furthermore, in both samples boys' scores tended to be higher than girls' scores, although in no instances were the differences significant. Therefore, with the exception of two parameters to be noted below, the two samples are highly similar.

Difference exists in two respects, one of minor importance and the other possibly of considerable interest. In the first case, the Newcomers showed a difference in scores between the two towns which either approached or exceeded significance on every question. In the METCO sample, scores for the two towns were virtually identical on every question. It is difficult to interpret this finding. Town B Newcomer scores were typically closer to the Norm than any of the others. While this was true for both boys and girls, it was especially true for the boys. If the sample had been unusually small we might attribute the result to the undue influence of a small number of very high scorers. In fact, Town B boys, with N=37, are the largest subgroup in either sample. Thus we are left with the finding and look toward subsequent data for explication.

The second, more interesting difference between the two samples lies in the differential levels for Question I scores as opposed to Questions II and III scores for METCO. The results summarized in Table V-3 suggested a systematic effect operating to lower Question I scores beyond a point predictable from Question II and III scores. At the same time, this effect was found not to hold for Newcomers. If we assume that the Newcomer sample represents a Norm for transfer students in general, then given the other similarities between METCO and Newcomer, one would want to pursue this particular discrepancy more closely.

The reason may well lie in the wording of the questions and certain objective factors in the METCO situation. Question I is a question of fact: who do you play with? For the most part, there is little informal contact between METCO students and town residents after school closes for the day. Assuming that most play among children takes place after school and on weekends, it would be difficult for METCO students to be named with high frequency on this question, accepting the question at face value. In fact, the presence of high individual scorers on that question indicates that it was not necessarily interpreted as applying to out-of-school contexts. There is no question, however, that transfer students who actually move into the neighborhood served by an elementary school are in a much better position to become playmates of the residents, all other things being equal, than students who arrive and depart by bus each day. Thus, the only significant differences between METCO and Newcomer scores are on Question I.

Question II asks for a preference rather than a fact. In a very small way, the students can indicate in responding how they might like to see their classroom world rearranged. Question III asks for a rather personal item: who is your best friend in the class? That is more than a question of fact in that wish-fulfillment may well be involved in the answer--i.e., who would you like to have as your best friend? It is notable, then, that the METCO and Newcomer samples are not very different on these questions. METCO students, in effect, are being reacted to on these measures very much as any set of students new to the given schools. The major item differentiating METCO from Newcomer is one which is highly dependent on factors external to the nature of the students--their residency in another city. Consequently, the data reported above suggest that after four months of the METCO program, METCO students are typical of newcomers generally in terms of sociometric popularity.

VI. Findings: The Index of Reciprocation

The Index of Reciprocation (I.R.) was computed as the ratio of the number of times a student was chosen by others divided into the number of those choices that were reciprocated. A student who was chosen four times, two of which were reciprocated, would have an I.R. of .500. Values for the I.R. can range from .000 to 1.000. This section will present findings concerning group I.R. means for all groups including the Norm. The Norm in this instance was composed of individual students in a sample of the available classes, stratified by town, grade and sex with approximately the same ratios as existed in the METCO sample. The size of any Norm sub-sample (by town and sex) was never less than 150 and typically about 200.

A. Group Mean Scores. The same groups are used for this analysis as for that of the popularity scores, with certain differences. The Newcomer sample is slightly larger because new names were added to the list subsequent to analysis of the popularity data. Modifications will be made in the popularity-data analysis for the final report of this evaluation. The Norm sample, instead of including all non-METCO or non-Newcomer students is composed as described above. The METCO sample remains the same, but scores were computed in two different ways. The first way, reported subsequently under the heading METCO, is the standard procedure for computing the I.R. However, because a difference of one or two reciprocals can have a marked effect on an individual I.R., it was felt necessary to derive an I.R. that would not include reciprocals between METCO students. Consequently, a modified I.R. was derived for the METCO sample computed as the standard version, except that all reciprocals with other METCO students are subtracted from the numerator initially. This modified I.R. will be reported below under the heading METCO*.

Insofar as we assume that reciprocation is meaningful and important, regardless of its source, the standard I.R. is a relevant measure. The modified I.R. is more an index of inner-group reciprocation, relevant as a measure between METCO students as a group and non-METCO students as a group. It is more valid than either the popularity score or the standard I.R. as a measure of group integration, in that mutual acceptance is involved. The popularity score indicates the degree of acceptance (of a sort) of METCO by the others; the I.R. measures the extent to which METCO students are engaged in reciprocal relationships; but only the modified I.R. reveals the extent to which METCO students accept the suburban students.[1]

Table V-8 presents the mean I.R. and related data for each group. For Questions I and II, Norm scores ranged between .503 and .674; METCO, from .366 to .758; METCO*, from .366 to .631; and Newcomers, from .455 to .6[illegible]. On Question III (which, with only one choice made per student, had lower possible scores), the ranges were as follows: Norm, .242 to [illegible]; METCO, .038 to .313; METCO*, .038 to .250; and Newcomers, .167 to .235. The METCO sets show the greatest variability. In all instances, they were higher and lower than any of the other groups. Newcomers and the Norm tend to show much less fluctuation among the various means and tend to have smaller variances than the METCO sample.

Looking at the data for towns combined, there do not seem to be any major differences among the various groups with the exception of METCO* on Question III. Reciprocation on the "best friend" question showed a marked change from METCO to METCO* for this set of scores, indicating a fairly high level of within-METCO reciprocation. This is clearly most extreme for girls in Town C, but substantial for girls in Town B as well. Differences between METCO and METCO* were considerably smaller for boys. The more important fact to emerge from Table V-8 is the relatively small differences among all of the groups.

---

[1] In the data analysis there would be great possibilities for clarification in comparing the I.R. with the modified I.R. for only those METCO students who are in a position to choose each other. Unfortunately, this sample would be extremely small and subject to the influences of individual idiosyncrasies. In the 1967-1968 sociometric data, this N will be substantially larger and such a comparison therefore possible.

Table V-6

I.P. Mean and Associated Statistics for Norm, METCO, METCO* and Newcomers

Question Town & Sex	Norm N	Norm Mean	Norm s^2	METCO N	METCO Mean	METCO s^2	METCO* Mean	METCO* s^2	Newcomer[1] N	Newcomer[1] Mean	Newcomer[1] s^2
I B - Boys	222	.568	.094	13	.366	.167	.366	.167	38	.575	.109
Girls	205	.626	.082	15	.644	.091	.633	.128	34	.669	.088
C - Boys	191	.621	.092	20	.651	.167	.468	.190	25	.648	.102
	167	.674	.084	23	.758	.152	.513	.234	24	.598	.117
II B - Boys	222	.564	.085	13	.431	.176	.392	.190	38	.458	.179
Girls	205	.577	.085	15	.560	.091	.545	.090	34	.482	.075
C - Boys	191	.503	.095	20	.429	.076	.429	.076	25	.497	.117
Girls	167	.568	.080	23	.597	.144	.500	.176	24	.534	.121
III B - Boys	222	.242	.550	13	.038	.019	.038	.019	38	.285	.169
Girls	205	.268	.157	15	.267	.174	.167	.131	34	.275	.183
C - Boys	191	.259	.169	20	.313	.228	.250	.208	25	.173	.140
Girls	167	.280	.156	23	.239	.187	.087	.087	24	.167	.101
Towns Combined											
I Boys	413	.593	.096	33	.508	.171	.428	.172	63	.605	.104
Girls	372	.647	.083	38	.713	.124	.561	.165	58	.640	.097
II Boys	413	.536	.090	33	.430	.109	.430	.109	63	.493	.109
Girls	372	.573	.082	38	.582	.117	.516	.135	58	.503	.091
III Boys	413	.264	.151	33	.205	.154	.167	.134	63	.241	.154
Girls	372	.273	.155	38	.250	.172	.118	.100	58	.230	.150

---

[1] Newcomer N's differ slightly from those presented in prior tables; data concerning Newcomers became more complete subsequent to compilation of popularity data.

Table V-9 summarizes the results of t-tests among the various groups.

Table V-9

Significance of Differences Between Mean I.R. Scores for Norm, METCO, METCO*, and Newcomers

A. METCO v. Norm and Newcomers

Question,	Town and Sex	Norm t	Norm prob.	Newcomers t	Newcomers prob.
Question I					
	B - Boys	-1.78	.10 (n.s.)	-1.85	.10 (n.s.)
	Girls		n.s.		n.s.
	C - Boys		n.s.		n.s.
	Girls		n.s.		n.s.
Question II					
	B - Boys		n.s.		n.s.
	Girls		n.s.		n.s.
	C - Boys		n.s.		n.s.
	Girls		n.s.		n.s.
Question III					
	B - Boys	-5.34	.001***	-2.11	.05*
	Girls		n.s.		n.s.
	C - Boys		n.s.		n.s.
	Girls		n.s.		n.s.
Towns Combined					
Question I	Boys		n.s.		n.s.
	Girls		n.s.		n.s.
Question II	Boys	-1.84	.10 (n.s.)		n.s.
	Girls		n.s.		n.s.
Question III	Boys		n.s.		n.s.
	Girls		n.s.		n.s.

Table V-9 (continued)

B. METCO* v. Norm and Newcomer

Question, Town and Sex	Norm t	Norm prob.	Newcomers t	Newcomers prob.
Question I				
B - Boys	-1.78	.10 (n.s.)	-1.85	.10 (n.s.)
Girls	n.s.		n.s.	
C - Boys	n.s.		n.s.	
Girls	n.s.		n.s.	
Question II				
B - Boys	n.s.		n.s.	
Girls	n.s.		n.s.	
C - Boys	n.s.		n.s.	
Girls	n.s.		n.s.	
Question III				
B - Boys	-5.34	.001***	-2.11	.05*
Girls	n.s.		n.s.	
C - Boys	n.s.		n.s.	
Girls	-3.21	.01**	n.s.	
Question I				
Boys	-2.28	.05*	-2.31	.05*
Girls	n.s.		n.s.	
Question II				
Boys	-1.72	.10 (n.s.)	n.s.	
Girls	n.s.		n.s.	
Question III				
Boys	n.s.		n.s.	
Girls	-3.02	.01**	n.s.	

Table V-3 (continued)

C. Newcomers v. Norm

Question, Town and Sex	Norm t	Norm prob.
Question I		
B - Boys	n.s.	
Girls	n.s.	
C - Boys	n.s.	
Girls	n.s.	
Question II		
B - Boys	-1.69	.10 (n.s.)
Girls	-2.42	.05*
C - Boys	n.s.	
Girls	n.s.	
Question III		
B - Boys	n.s.	
Girls	n.s.	
C - Boys	n.s.	
Girls	-3.07	.01**
Towns Combined		
Question I		
Boys	n.s.	
Girls	n.s.	
Question II		
Boys	n.s.	
Girls	-1.77	.10 (n.s.)
Question III		
Boys	n.s.	
Girls	n.s.	

Of the 24 *t*-tests involving the METCO sample (by town and sex), only two are significant (i.e., 8.3%, a value which is only slightly greater than we would expect randomly). Both of these involve METCO boys from Town B on Question III. By and large, however, the tests indicate that the METCO I.R. scores are not different from those of the Norm or the Newcomer samples. When scores for the two towns are combined, the METCO sample shows no significant differences.

For the METCO* sample, in which the I.R. scores do not contain any intra-METCO component, there is only one additional significant difference--again on Question III, this time for girls in Town C. There are no differences on the first two questions. It should be noted, by examination of Table V-8, that the METCO* scores are in all instances lower than the Norm and all but twice lower than the Newcomer sample. The differences are typically small, but the direction is consistent. When towns are combined, the METCO* scores are found to be significantly lower than both Norm and Newcomer for boys on Question I (which lends greater weight to the two t-values in section B, Question I, and Table V-9, which had probabilities between .10 and .05). Girls are also significantly lower on Question III, but boys are not.

Newcomer scores were significantly lower than the norm in only two instances--for girls in Town B on Question II and girls from Town C on Question III. The Question III finding is similar to the METCO sample; that for Question II has not been encountered previously. That it is not an enduring characteristic of newcomers to find their preference of seatmates unreciprocated can be seen in the t-tests for towns combined, where there are no significant differences.

The important fact that emerges from these tables is the degree of similarity among I.R. scores for all groups. The only important departures from the Norm are found among the METCO* scores on Question III. Even then, when towns are combined, the scores are less severely depressed than the results for one sex in one town might have indicated. The extremely low values for Town B boys and Town C girls tends to be offset by the scores of Town C boys and Town B girls.

In general, for all groups, the I.R. for girls is higher than for boys. When towns are combined, this difference is significant within the Norm group on Questions I and II (probabilities less than .01 and .05, respectively); for METCO, the difference is significant on Question I only (p .05), but approaches significance on Question II (.10 p .05). No differences for METCO* or Newcomers approach significance. It will be recalled that the popularity scores for METCO and Newcomer showed an opposite tendency, with girls receiving lower scores (but statistically non-significant). This suggests that although Newcomer and METCO girls are named less frequently than boys, a higher percent of these choices is reciprocated. Furthermore, this higher rate of reciprocation tends to be a characteristic of girls in general (not just METCO and Newcomers). It is also interesting to note that the METCO I.R. scores closely reflect Norm sex differences, while this is not true for either METCO* or Newcomers. In this respect, the METCO sample is more typical of the Norm than the Newcomers.

Insofar as differences exist between questions, they are minor. Question I scores are slightly higher than Question II. The much lower scores for Question III are an artifact of the questionnaire, of course, in that each student could only choose once rather than five times. Insofar as differences exist between towns, they are significant mainly in the Norm. Thus, on Question I, Town C boys and girls are both significantly higher than Town B boys and girls. Town C boys are also higher on Question III, but Town B boys are higher on Question II. These differences are all significant statistically. Although the results are mixed, it appears that Town C boys tend to engage in a higher percent of reciprocal relationships than Town B boys. When sexes are combined, Town C is significantly higher than Town B on Question I, but not on the others (Town B is higher on Question II, with a probability between .10 and .05). Only the METCO scores, among the smaller samples, reflect these town differences: Town C boys on Question III are significantly higher than Town B boys. When sexes are combined, however, Town C is higher than Town B on Question I, but not on the others. The difference is non-significant (.10 p .05). Inter-town differences in the Newcomer and METCO* samples are trivial.

B. Index of Reciprocation: Summary and Discussion. Typical I.R. scores for the Norm were determined to be in the range .56 to .63 for Questions I and II. For Question III, the mean scores were between .24 and .29. METCO means on any given question were as a rule lower than the Norm. The difference was significant only for Town B boys on Question III; when towns were combined, there were no significant differences between METCO and the Norm. Similar findings were reported for Newcomers in comparison with the Norm. Town B girls on Question II and Town C girls on Question III were significantly low; when towns were combined, there were no significant differences. When METCO was compared with Newcomers, only Town B METCO boys on Question III were significantly low; again, when towns were combined, no differences were significant.

When within-METCO reciprocations were removed from the METCO scores, the differences increased. Thus, for METCO*, Town C girls as well as Town B boys were significantly low on Question III; and, when towns were combined, boys on Question I and girls on Question III were significantly lower than the Norm. METCO* differed from the Newcomers only slightly more than METCO, however. In addition to the differences already given, METCO* boys on Question I were significantly lower than Newcomers (towns combined); otherwise, no new differences appeared.

Differences between sexes and between towns were found in the Norm. In general, girls tended to have higher I.R. scores than boys, and Town C tended to be higher than Town B. While significant differences were found, there were some inconsistencies in the results (i.e., boys were occasionally higher than girls; Town B was in one instance higher than Town C) making it difficult to call these findings conclusive. While METCO tended to reflect these differences within the Norm, Newcomers and METCO* did not.

The most important finding concerning the I.R. was that differences between METCO on the one hand and the Norm and Newcomers on the other were almost at a level that could be attributed to random selection. When towns were combined, and the subject is METCO students rather than METCO students of a certain town, no differences could be found. Therefore, insofar as the Index of Reciprocation measures a level of important interaction among students in a class, METCO students tend to be no less engaged than any other group in this study. It is perhaps more meaningful that when intra-METCO reciprocation is removed, the METCO sample tends, with certain exceptions, to operate at close to the same level as the Norm and the Newcomers. In other words, the magnitude of METCO I.R. scores does not largely reflect choices and reciprocal choices among METCO students.

It must be borne in mind, of course, that the opportunity for such intra-METCO reciprocation was severely restricted by the assignment of the METCO students to classrooms (see above, p. 2). Therefore, the findings reported here for METCO* should be regarded as tentative. Sociometric data collected during the school year 1967-1968 will provide a much stronger test of the extent of intra-METCO reciprocation.

One final datum deserves brief comment, The existence of certain differences by sex and town within the Norm suggests that as new groups enter the Norm classrooms they will tend to reflect these same differences in time, all other things being equal. It is somewhat surprising that the METCO sample, but not the Newcomers, have begun to show the same differences after only five months in the new schools. Noting that these patterns no longer existed after intra-METCO reciprocation was removed, it appears that the METCO students, when all of their reciprocal relationships are included, are more similar to the Norm than Newcomers. When examining only the inter-group reciprocations, however, the METCO students are more like Newcomers. It is possible, then, that the existence of METCO as a relatively well-defined entity as compared with Newcomers is a source of strength facilitating intra-group reciprocation.

VII. Conclusions.

The final portion of this report will compare the findings with the hypotheses listed above (p. 7). As was indicated at that point, each of the hypotheses will be tested for each criterion, each sex group and each question. When determining which of the five conditions is met (see above, pp. 8-9), findings will be collapsed across questions so that the finding for the predominant number of questions will be taken as the finding for the hypothesis (on that criterion and for that sex group). Table VII-1 indicates the situations in which hypotheses were confirmed (a + symbol indicates confirmation; and a - symbol indicates non-confirmation).

Table VII-1

Confirmation of Hypotheses, by Criterion, Sex and Question

Criterion, Sex * Question	Hyp. I	Hyp. II	Hyp. III	Condition Satisfied
A. Popularity				
Boys - Qu. I	-	-	+	
Qu. II	+	+	+	
Qu. III	-	+	+	
Average[1]	-	+	+	(d)
Girls Qu. I	-	-	-	
Qu. II	-	+	-	
Qu. III	-	+	-	
Average	-	+	-	
B. Reciprocation				
Boys - Qu. I	+	+	+	
Qu. II	+	+	+	
Qu. III	+	+	+	
Average	+	+	+	(a)
Girls Qu. I	+	+	+	
Qu. II	+	+	+	
Qu. III	+	+	+	(a)
Average	+	+	+	
C. Reciprocation*[2]				
Boys - Qu. I	-	-	+	
Qu. II	+	+	+	
Qu. III	+	+	+	
Average	+	+	+	(a)
Girls Qu. I	+	+	+	
Qu. II	+	+	+	
Qu. III	-	+	+	
Average	+	+	+	(a)

---

[1] The average value for a given hypothesis is the value common to two or three of the questions.

[2] Reciprocation* refers to findings for METCO*.

For convenience, the hypotheses are summarized here as follows:

Hyp. I No difference between METCO and Norm
Hyp. II No difference between METCO and Newcomers
Hyp. III No difference between Newcomers and Norm

Hypothesis I is in general not confirmed on the popularity criterion, but is confirmed on the two reciprocation criteria. Hypothesis II is generally confirmed on all criteria. Hypothesis III is confirmed for boys but not for girls on the popularity criterion; on the other two criteria it is confirmed.

In order to discuss what analytical conditions have been met, only the findings for the categories headed "Average" will be used. For the popularity criterion, Condition (d) obtains for boys and Condition (b) for girls. Under Condition (d) it was indicated that METCO students, "while within the range of randomly selected transfer students, are, unlike the transfer students, negatively distinguished by their classmates" (above, pp. 8-9). It was further pointed out that an important difference existed between this condition and Condition (c), in that METCO could still be regarded as a part of the Newcomer sample, though a low-scoring (relatively) part. The findings for girls indicated that, under the terms of Condition (b), the METCO students were negatively distinguished by their classmates, but no more so than any set of transfer students.

Under the general reciprocation criterion, Condition (a) was found to hold for boys and girls. In fact, there was confirmation of the hypothesis in every sub-category. Condition (a) states that "METCO students are, like any set of transfer students selected randomly, not negatively distinguished by their classmates" (above, p. 8). In the case of the restricted reciprocation criterion, in which reciprocation between METCO and non-METCO only was under consideration, the same Condition (a) was found to exist.

A general summary of the findings, then, includes the following points:

1. While METCO boys are significantly less popular than the Norm, they

are still within the range of other transfer boys, who, on the other hand, are not significantly lower than the Norm.

2. While METCO girls are significantly less popular than the Norm, they are no different from the other transfer girls, who are also significantly lower than the Norm.

3. METCO boys and girls, as well as other transfer students, show no differences from the Norm in the percentage of choices reciprocated.

4. METCO boys and girls show no differences from the Norm or from other transfer students in their reciprocal percentages after reciprocal choices with other METCO students are removed.

When compared with the goals of METCO outlined in the first part of this report, it appears that no evidence existed as of January, 1967, that these goals could not be met. Although METCO students were significantly lower than their classmates on popularity indices, they did not score significantly lower than other transfer students. The fact that girls appeared to be in a slightly more advantageous position than boys is an artifact of the very high scores for transfer boys in one town. Otherwise, Condition (b) might well have been true for boys as well as girls.

The more important aspect of the sociometric analysis is the comparison of METCO and Newcomers over a number of points in time. Their initial positions were not markedly different. A subsequent report will detail the findings of data collected in October, February and June of the 1967-1968 school year.

REFERENCES

Archibald, D. K. *Report on change in academic achievement for a sample of elementary school children.* A report to the United States Office of Education, under P.L. 89-10, Title III, Project #661465. Mimeographed. 1966

Goodman, Mary Ellen. *Race awareness in young children.* Addison-Wesley (Cambridge, 1952).

Moreno, J. L. *Who shall survive?* Beacon House (New York, 1953), revision of the 1934 edition.

Mouton, Jane S., *et al.* "The reliability of sociometric measures," in Moreno, J.L., et al. *The Sociometry Reader.* The Free Press (Glencoe, 1960), 326-361. (a)

Mouton, Jane S., *et al.* "The validity of sociometric measures", in Moreno, J.L., et al. *The Sociometry Reader.* The Free Press (Glencoe, 1960), 362-385. (b)

Northway, Mary L. *A primer of sociometry.* University of Toronto Press (Toronto, 1952).

Northway, Mary L. "Outsiders", in Moreno, J.L., et al. *The Sociometry Reader.* The Free Press (Glencoe, 1960), 455-470.

Teele, J. E., Schleifer, M. J., *et al.* "Teacher ratings, sociometric status, and choice-reciprocity of anti-social and normal boys", in *Group Psychotherapy* (XIX), 1967, 183-197.

APPENDIX A

Sociometric Questionnaire,
Teacher Questionnaire and Instructions

ADMINISTERING THE FRIENDSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE TO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PUPILS

Enclosed are the materials you will need for administering the questionnaires on friendship. Please check your materials before administering to see if you have sufficient copies. We have included:

20 copies of the questionnaire for boys
20 copies of the questionnaire for girls
1 copy of a form for the teacher to complete

Directions for Administering:

(Material enclosed in boxes to be read aloud.)

1. Hand out a copy of the appropriate questionnaire to each boy and girl. In some cases, the second page of the questionnaire may be different; this is deliberate and should cause no concern.

2. Ask each pupil to fill in his own name, teacher's name, grade and the name of the school, in the upper right-hand corner. The date goes in the upper left-hand corner.

   For your convenience the following paragraph is repeated on the instructions for teachers' form.

   > We all agree that friendships are very important. Many people are interested in how friendships are formed. There is also much interest in how such friendships differ for boys and girls. You are asked to help us explore these questions.
   >
   > Carefully read each of the questions on the first page. Be sure to write in the first and last name of the persons the question asks you to name. If the question asks for five names, and you cannot think of five, write in all that you can think of.

   After five minutes, say:

   > Time is up. Turn to the next page and answer those questions.

   After an additional five minutes say:

   > Time is up. Be sure that your name is in the upper right-hand corner.

3. Teachers are asked to answer the eight questions on the enclosed questionnaire.

To be completed by teachers only

(Since experience has shown that first impressions are most pertinent to the study of friendship in education, please complete this questionnaire as quickly as possible. Students can be listed for more than one question.)

Name ______________________

School ______________________

Grade ______________________

Date ______________________

1. Please name the three boys whom you consider to be most likely to be popular in class activities. (Name fewer than three if you wish.)

   1. ______________________
   2. ______________________
   3. ______________________

2. Please name the three boys in your class who, in your opinion, are most unpopular. (Again, name fewer than three if you wish.)

   1. ______________________
   2. ______________________
   3. ______________________

3. Please name the three boys (or fewer) who, in your opinion, are most disruptive. Also indicate the two closest associates of each of the boys you name.

	______________________
1. ______________________	______________________
	______________________
2. ______________________	______________________
	______________________
3. ______________________	______________________

4. Please name the three boys (or fewer) whom you consider most helpful in class activities.

   1. ______________________________

   2. ______________________________

   3. ______________________________

5. Now name the three girls (or fewer) in the class who are most likely to be popular in class activities.

   1. ______________________________

   2. ______________________________

   3. ______________________________

6. Please name the three girls (or fewer) in the class whom you consider to be the most unpopular.

   1. ______________________________

   2. ______________________________

   3. ______________________________

7. Please name the three girls (or fewer) who, in your opinion, are most disruptive. Also, indicate the two closest associates of each of the girls you name.

   1. ______________________________ ______________________________
      ____

   2. ______________________________ ______________________________
      ____

   3. ______________________________ ______________________________
      ____

8. Please name the three girls (or fewer) whom you consider most helpful in class activities.

   1. ______________________________

   2. ______________________________

   3. ______________________________

Grade School Boys

Date ______________________ Name of Student ______________________

Teacher's Name ______________________

School ______________________

Grade ______________________

1. First, in the space just below, write the names of the five boys in the class with whom you play.

1. ______________________ 4. ______________________

2. ______________________ 5. ______________________

3. ______________________

2. Now, if you had your pick as to whom you would sit next to, what five boys would you prefer to be sitting close to? Please write down the first and last names.

1. ______________________ 4. ______________________

2. ______________________ 5. ______________________

3. ______________________

3. Next write down the names of your five closest friends in the school as a whole. You may include boys from this class whom you have named before.

1. ______________________ 4. ______________________

2. ______________________ 5. ______________________

3. ______________________

4. Who is your closest friend among the boys in this class?

____

5. Please write down the names of the five boys you most often play with after school hours, no matter what school they attend.

1. ______________________ 4. ______________________

2. ______________________ 5. ______________________

3. ______________________

We're also interested in the kinds of careers students plan to follow, as well as how many boys and girls plan to work at what their parents worked at. Thus, we have two last questions:

6. What kind of job does your father work at? ______________________

7. What kind of work do you want to do when you grow up? ______________________

____

Grade School

Ratings of Friendship Characteristics

Date ______________________

Name of Student ______________________

Grade ______________________

School ______________________

Some typical qualities of friends are listed below. Please draw a circle around the Yes if the word preceding it is one of the things you look for when making friends. If it is not one of the things you look for, draw a circle around No.

Is very popular with others	Yes	No
Is bigger than me	Yes	No
Is a nice person	Yes	No
Gets along with teachers	Yes	No
Is very good looking	Yes	No
Is very strong	Yes	No
Fun to be with	Yes	No
Lives in a nice house	Yes	No
Has a lot of nice clothes	Yes	No
Understands me	Yes	No
Always on my side, right or wrong	Yes	No
Smart in school	Yes	No

APPENDIX B

A Simulated Choice Matrix
and Roster of Scores

A Simulated Choice Matrix and Roster of Scores

Printed output from the computer program described in the text is of the form shown in Appendix B.

```
METCO SOCIOMETRIC ANALYSIS
TOWN IS  X      SCHOOL IS  Y
GRADE   5    ROOM NO. 10    SIZE  =  10    QUESTION  1

               1     2     3     4    30    31    32    33    50    60

       1       0     1*    0     1     0     0     0     0     1*    0

       2       1*    0     0     1     0     0     0     0     0     0

       3       0     1     0     1*    0     0     0     0     0     0

       4       0     0     1*    0     0     0     0     0     1     0

      30       0     0     0     0     0     0     1*    1*    0     1*

      31       0     0     0     0     1     0     0     0     0     0

      32       0     0     0     0     1*    0     1*    1*    0     1

      33       0     0     0     0     1*    0     0     0     0     0

      50       1*    1     1     0     0     0     0     0     0     0

      60       0     0     0     0     1*    0     1     1     0     0
            ____________________________________________________________

TOTAL          2     3     2     3     4     0     3     3     1     2


FOR THIS QUESTION, VALUES OF          N         MEAN       ST. DEV.

                          BOYS        5          2.2        0.84
                          GIRLS       5          2.4        1.55
```

Student No.	First Choices			Scores		
	Qu. I	Qu. II	Qu. III	Qu. I	Qu. II	Qu. III
1	2			- .24		
2	1			+ .96		
3	4			- .24		
4	2			+ .96		
30	33			+ 1.05		
31	30			- 1.56		
32	30			+ .40		
33	32			+ .40		
50	1			- 1.44		
60	33			- .26		

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

REPORT

TO

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

BY

RUTH M. BATSON
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

September 19, 1968

PARTICIPATING COMMUNITIES

1968 - 1969

PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM	TUITION COST PER PUPIL	NO. OF STUDENTS	
ARLINGTON	$484.00	31	14 Jr. High 15 Kindegarten 2 Elementary
BRAINTREE	450.00	20	Jr. High and High School
BROOKLINE	560.00	128	62 Elementary 66 High School
LEXINGTON	415.00	89	25 High School 64 Elementary
LINCOLN	301.00	50	Kindegarten, 1st and 2nd
WELLESLEY	900.00 (1st 25) 450.00 (All Others)	73	25 Jr. High 48 High School
NEWTON	21.00 (Elementary) 30.00 (Jr. High)	100	Jr. High and Elementary
CONCORD-CARLISLE	450.00	29	29 High School
MARBLEHEAD	350.00	26	Jr. High and High School
SHARON	527.80	38	Jr. High
WALPOLE	325.00	24	Elementary
WESTON	237.00	18	Kindegarten and 1st grade

PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM	TUITION COST PER PUPIL	NO. OF STUDENTS	
WESTWOOD	400.00	24	Elementary
FRAMINGHAM	230.00	46	Elementary
READING	300.00	9	Elementary
CONCORD	330.00	25	Elementary
SWAMPSCOTT	650.00	16	Elementary
NATICK	None	20	Jr. High
MILTON	120.00	29	High School
HINGHAM	100.00	16	High School
LINCOLN-SUDBURY	None	11	High School
SCITUATE	466.24	17	Elementary
WAYLAND	None	9	High School
DOVER	572.00	9	Elementary
LYNNFIELD	600.00	15	Jr. High
COHASSETT	100.00	9	Jr. High
WAKEFIELD	417.51	9	Elementary
*NEEDHAM		20	High School

* $15,240 for [illegible] children - this figure includes tuition and transportation costs for the twenty students.

Number of Spaces Not Filled - 27

Community		
Brookline	2	1 High School, 1 Elementary
Lexington	1	Elementary
Wellesley	2	High School
Concord-Carlisle	1	High School
Westwood	1	Elementary
Framingham	4	Elementary
Swampscott	4	Elementary
Milton	1	High School
Hingham	4	High School
Lincoln-Sudbury	1	High School
Scituate	3	Elementary
Wayland	1	High School
Dover	2	Elementary

Total Number of Students in Program - 907

Total Number of Participating Communities - 28

* We are also working in cooperation with the Bridge by providing transportation for 50 children attending parochial school in suburban communities.

NEW CAREERS PROGRAM

I reported on this program in my last report to the Board. Herb Owens, the newest member of our staff, joined us on July 29 and took over the supervision of this program. He will give the Board a complete and detailed report at our next meeting. However, to date, Herb has placed nineteen people (4 men and 15 women) in the program. They are working as library aides, audio visual, language and teacher aides. They are also being trained as lunchroom aides.

These aides have been placed in the following communities:

Concord	4	Framingham	2
Brookline	7	Lexington	1
Lincoln	3	Newton	2

IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR TEACHERS

As the result of the efforts of Dr. Norman Zinberg, this program initiated last spring, has been funded by the Ford Foundation. The grant is in the amount of $27,200 a year for two years. This will enable METCO to expand its program greatly. Dr. Zinberg is in England for a year. On his recommendation, Harold N. Bor Psychologist, will serve as Group Supervisor and Mrs. Florence Shelton will fill the position of Administrative Director.

Our relationship with the Judge Baker Clinic will be continued this year. We were very pleased with the two people who worked with us last year, Bert Meltzer and Mrs. Doris Johnson, and we look forward to another good year.

We will also have assigned to the METCO office students from Harvard and Tufts Universities and a Law Intern from Harvard Law School for the coming school year.

WINCHESTER

I feel that the Board should be informed of the events which led to the decision not to go to Winchester. We were approached by Dr. Donald Klemer, the newly appointed superintendent of the Winchester public schools. He expressed his desire, and that of the majority of the School Board, to be considered again for METCO. At first, it appeared that there was no issue because of funds and the lateness of the filing of the application. However, certain budgetary changes made it possible for Winchester to be considered and 25 spaces (grades 1, 2 & 3) were offered in two schools: Tufts Road and Parkhurst. The School Committee voted 4 - 2 to participate. After the School Committee vote, a special town meeting endorsed the School Committee action by a vote of 97 to 47. The anti-METCO group in Winchester collected enough signatures, making it possible for a town-wide referendum on participation in METCO. On being informed of the coming referendum, my own personal feeling was that we should not go to Winchester. However, after a long discussion with the staff, it was decided to make the following recommendation to the METCO Executive Committee which was scheduled to meet on August 14:

> That METCO approve the sending of children to Winchester after a full discussion with parents on the past history and present happenings in that community (including the coming referendum); that the children not be sent to Winchester if the vote on the referendum was not in favor of METCO or if the majority vote in favor of METCO was not at least a 50% majority; that alternate provisions be made in advance for families who accepted placement in Winchester.

We did find families who after being informed of the Winchester story said that they would send their children. The Executive Committee voted to accept the recommendation of the staff with one opposed - Mrs. Kathy Jones.

On Tuesday, September 3, approximately 41% of the town's registered voters ballotted 23000 to 1922 against the enrollment in METCO. We then called all of the parents we could reach to ask if they would still send their children in spite of this vote (which was not binding on the School Committee). They all said no. At that point, in keeping with the vote of the Executive Committee and the decision of the parents, we said no to Winchester.

We are receiving many requests and visits from other school systems throughout the country interested in METCO-type programs. We are now beginning to come out from under the pressure of getting 900 children into school and now hope to get started on the many other programs which are so very important to this program.

It is always very risky to make special mention of those who contribute in any venture, for always someone equally deserving is omitted. METCO is a team effort and so many people -- students, parents, staff, volunteer committees, superintendents, teachers, etc. -- are involved. However, I feel I would be remiss if I did not call attention to the consistent cooperation given us by Dr. Tom Curtin of the State Department of Education. Mr. Al Reilley, Superintendent of Schools in Framingham, is another person whose flexibility and sensitivity to some of the problems which came up helped immensely.

There is a good deal of work to do, especially in the area of tutorial help. I hope to be able to report real progress in our problem areas when we meet next.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth M Batson

Rubth M. Batson
Executive Director

METCO RESEARCH PROJECT

Student Questionnaire

October, 1968

Instructions

Please read each question carefully and answer it accurately. This is not a test; there are no right or wrong answers, and there is no time limit to this portion of the session. The answers to the questions in this form are strictly confidential. Most questions can be answered by circling the letter next to the answer that comes closest to your opinion or situation. (Example: [✓ A.] Yes B. No). A few questions are to be answered in your own words in the space provided. Please write your name and school below in the spaces provided, and then go on to the questions on the following pages.

Name____

School____

1. What grade are you in?

   A. 7th
   B. 8th
   C. 9th
   D. 10th
   E. 11th
   F. 12th

2. Are you in the METCO program?

   A. Yes
   B. No

3. IF YES: How many years have you been in the program, not counting this coming year?

   A. None (this will be my first year)
   B. One semester
   C. One year
   D. One and one-half years
   E. Two or more years

4. On the whole, how favorable are you towards the METCO program?

   A. Very favorable
   B. Somewhat favorable
   C. Not favorable

5. What is most favorable (or unfavorable) about METCO?

   ____

   ____

6. How favorable would you say most of your black friends are toward the METCO program?

   A. Very favorable
   B. Somewhat favorable
   C. Not favorable

7. Do you have any black friends who have criticized you for going to school in the white suburbs?

   A. Yes, many
   B. Yes, a few
   C. No

8. If you could have anyone you wanted for your close friends, how many of them would be white?

A. None
B. Less than half
C. About half
D. More than half
E. All
F. Don't care

9. If you could be in any school you wanted, how many teachers would be white?

A. None
B. Less than half
C. About half
D. More than half
E. All
F. Don't care

10. If you could be in any school you wanted, how many students would be white?

A. None
B. Less than half
C. About half
D. More than half
E. All
F. Don't care

11. How good a student do you want to be in school?

A. One of the best in my class
B. Above the middle of my class
C. In the middle of my class
D. Just good enough to get by
E. Don't care

12. How far do you want to go in school?

A. I would like to stop before finishing high school
B. Finish high school only
C. Technical, nursing, or business school after high school
D. Some college, but less than 4 years
E. Graduation from 4 year college
F. Professional or graduate work after college
G. Not sure

13. Which of these types of job come closest to the kind you expect to have after finishing your education?

A. Professional or technical (teacher, draftsman, doctor, nurse, laboratory technician, etc.)
B. Workman (farm worker, fisherman, gardener, laborer, longshoreman, etc.)
C. Clerical (secretary, bank teller, bookkeeper, postman, office worker, etc.)
D. Managerial or official (pilot, train conductor, owner of a store, government official, business executive, farm owner, etc.)
E. Craftsman (carpenter, electrician, plumber, mechanic, etc.)
F. Service (fireman, policeman, barber, cook, hospital attendant, waiter, hairdresser. etc.)
G. Operative (machine operator, bus driver, factory worker, sailor, deliveryman, etc.)
H. Sales (salesmen, agents, brokers, advertising, etc.)
I. Other (Specify: ______________________________)
J. Don't know

14. How far do your parents want you to go in school?

A. Don't care if I finish high school
B. Finish high school only
C. Technical, nursing, or business school after high school
D. Some college
E. Graduate from 4 year college
F. Professional or graduate school
G. Don't know

15. How bright do you think you are in comparison with all the other students in your grade?

A. Among the brightest
B. Above average
C. Average
D. Below average
E. Among the lowest

16. How active would you say you are in school social activities in comparison with all the other students in your grade?

A. More active than most
B. About average
C. Less active than most

17. How popular do you think you were in school last year in comparison with all the other students in your grade?

A. Among the more popular
B. About average
C. Among the less popular

18. If we could assume all [illegible] ools were equally good, would you ideally prefer go[illegible] to school in the suburbs or in your own community?

    A. In the suburbs
    B. In own community
    C. Not sure

19. About how many times did you talk to a guidance counselor during the past year?

    A. Never D. Four or five times
    B. Once E. Six or more times
    C. Two or three times F. No counselor in school

20. IF SAW COUNSELOR ONE OR MORE TIMES: Would you say that the counselor was very helpful, somewhat helpful, or not helpful?

    A. Very helpful
    B. Somewhat helpful
    C. Not helpful

21. In what way was the counselor helpful or not helpful?

____

____

THE FOLLOWING ARE SOME STATEMENTS WHICH SOME PEOPLE AGREE WITH AND OTHERS DISAGREE WITH. FOR EACH ONE, INDICATE WHETHER YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE, OR ARE NOT SURE. THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS; JUST GIVE YOUR OWN OPINION.

22. On the whole, I'm pretty satisfied with my life so far.

    A. Strongly agree D. Disagree
    B. Agree E. Strongly disagree
    C. Not sure

23. My life will be better this coming year than it has been this past year.

    A. Strongly agree D. Disagree
    B. Agree E. Strongly disagree
    C. Not sure

24. Most black people should live and work in black areas, and most whites should live and work in white areas.

A. Strongly agree
B. Agree
C. Not sure
D. Disagree
E. Strongly disagree

25. In general, the demonstrations and rioting in the cities has helped the black people's cause.

A. Strongly agree
B. Agree
C. Not sure
D. Disagree
E. Strongly disagree

26. Black and white people have to learn to get along with one another in school, work, and social life.

A. Strongly agree
B. Agree
C. Not sure
D. Disagree
E. Strongly disagree

27. Most white people I've known are prejudiced against the black people, even though they may not actually show it.

A. Strongly agree
B. Agree
C. Not sure
D. Disagree
E. Strongly disagree

28. Black and white persons should not intermarry.

A. Strongly agree
B. Agree
C. Not sure
D. Disagree
E. Strongly disagree

29. Once you really get to know a white person, they can be as good a friend as anyone else.

A. Strongly agree
B. Agree
C. Not sure
D. Disagree
E. Strongly disagree

30. In our country the white people will probably never allow the black people to get full equality.

A. Strongly agree
B. Agree
C. Not sure
D. Disagree
E. Strongly disagree

31. If I could change, I would be someone different from myself.

A. Strongly agree
B. Agree
C. Not sure
D. Disagree
E. Strongly disagree

32. Most white persons are sympathetic with the black people's problems.

A. Strongly agree
B. Agree
C. Not sure
D. Disagree
E. Strongly disagree

THE FOLLOWING ARE THINGS A FAMILY MIGHT HAVE IN THEIR HOME. FOR EACH ONE INDICATE WHETHER OR NOT YOUR FAMILY HAS IT.

33. Television set A. Yes B. No

34. Automatic dishwasher A. Yes B. No

35. Telephone A. Yes B. No

36. Record player or hi fi A. Yes B. No

37. Refrigerator A. Yes B. No

38. Sewing machine A. Yes B. No

39. Dictionary A. Yes B. No

40. Encyclopedia A. Yes B. No

41. Automobile A. Yes B. No

42. Vacuum cleaner A. Yes B. No

43. Daily newspaper A. Yes B. No

44. Which of the following best desc[illegible]n who lives with you in your home?

A. My father and mother
B. My mother
C. My father, mother, and brothe[illegible]nd sisters
D. My mother and brothers and sis[illegible]s
E. My father, mother, and other relatives
F. My mother and other relatives
G. Other (Specify: ______________________________)

45. Which of the following best describes the kind of work your father does, if you know?

A. Professional or technical (teacher, draftsman, doctor, nurse, laboratory technician, etc.)
B. Workman (farmworker, fisherman, gardener, laborer, longshoreman, etc.)
C. Clerical (secretary, bank teller, bookkeeper, postman, office worker, etc.)
D. Managerial or official (pilot, train conductor, owner of a store, government official, business executive, farm owner, etc.)
E. Craftsman (carpenter, electrician, plumber, mechanic, etc.)
F. Service (fireman, policeman, barber, cook, hospital attendant, waiter, hairdresser, etc.)
G. Operative (machine operator, bus driver, factory worker, tailor, deliveryman, etc.)
H. Sales (salesman, agents, brokers, advertising, etc.)
I. Other (specify: ______________________________)
J. Don't know

46. Are you male or female?

A. Male
B. Female

161